

THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 6.

APRIL, 1892.

No. 1.

THE GROUNDS OF LUTHERAN DISSENSION IN THIS COUNTRY.

BY PROFESSOR J. W. RICHARD, D.D., THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, GETTYSBURG, PA.

To the question, Why are not all the Lutherans in this country united in one grand body, with generous concessions for individual differences of opinion, and with suitable provisions for the use of various languages? the plain answer is, *They do not all occupy the same relation to the Lutheran confessional writings of the sixteenth century*; that is (a) they do not all accept all the contents of the Lutheran Book of Concord, and (b) in cases where several bodies do accept and subscribe all the contents of the Book of Concord, they do not interpret every several article alike. In this is found the true ground of Lutheran dissension. It is *confessional* and *doctrinal diversity*.

That we may make this clear to the reader, we will state as fairly as we can the attitudes which different Lutheran bodies in this country hold to the Lutheran confessional writings—viz., the Augsburg Confession (1530); the Apology of the Confession (1531); the Smalcald Articles (1537); the two Catechisms of Luther (1529); the Form of Concord (1577); all of which, together with the three œcumenical creeds, were published as the BOOK OF CONCORD in the year 1580.

I. THE GENERAL SYNOD.—This body, which contains 1002 ministers, 1450 congregations, and 157,110 members, was organized in the year 1820. Because of the prevalent rationalistic spirit in one or two of the older and larger district synods uniting in the organization, it was not found practicable to place in the constitution even the name of any one of the above-mentioned Lutheran confessional writings. But when, three years after the organization, the Pennsylvania Synod withdrew, not for doctrinal, but wholly for practical reasons, the General Synod soon after took the Augsburg Confession as its doctrinal basis, and declared: "The fundamental doctrines of the Word of God are taught in a manner

substantially correct in the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession."

This *qualified* subscription to the Augsburg Confession was doubtless all that could be attained at that time, yet really it marks an epoch in the *confessional* life and history of the Lutheran Church in America. But in the year 1864 the General Synod made its confessional basis more clear and distinct by accepting "the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Divine Word, and of the faith of our Church founded upon that Word." And as further evidence of her firm adherence to the historic faith of the Lutheran Church, the professors in her theological seminary are required every five years to subscribe *ex animo* to the Augsburg Confession and to the Small Catechism, and to "promise solemnly not to teach anything, either directly or by insinuation, which shall appear to them to contradict or to be in any degree more or less remote" from these standards; and every candidate for the ministry is required to make personal subscription to the General Synod's doctrinal basis. But in giving what she believes to be an *unqualified* subscription to the Augsburg Confession, the General Synod does not cut herself off from recognition of and fellowship with other evangelical Christians; for her constitution makes it solemnly obligatory upon her to "be sedulously and incessantly regardful of the circumstances of the times, and of every casual rise and progress of unity of sentiment among Christians in general, in order that the blessed opportunities to promote concord and unity, and the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom may not pass by neglected and unavailing."

In thus *heartily* and *unqualifiedly* accepting the Augsburg Confession as her doctrinal basis, and in thus throwing the strongest guards round the teaching from her theological chairs and from her pulpits,

the General Synod plants herself firmly and squarely on the *original, generic, Catholic* Lutheranism, the Lutheranism on which Luther, Melancthon, Brentz, and other great reformers had agreed to stand, and on which they did stand, though, as is well known, they held different *shades* of view in reference to some doctrines embraced in their common confession.

Thus the Augsburg Confession—just that, no more, no less; the creed which gave distinctive life and doctrinal character to the Lutheran Church is the doctrinal standard of the General Synod. The Apology her theologians regard as an exceedingly valuable commentary on the Confession. The Small Catechism is employed in popular instruction. The Large Catechism is esteemed as a good and useful compend of Christian doctrine. The Smalcald Articles are valued very highly as in part a repetition of several doctrines of the Confession, but more especially as a testimony of our Church against the papal hierarchy. But least of all have the theologians of the General Synod been inclined toward the Form of Concord as a *confession*, and for the following reasons:

1. It introduces several articles which have no place in the Augsburg Confession.

(a) "The Third Use of the Law," which is connected with the antinomian controversy.

(b) "Christ's Descent into Hades," which gives confessional authority to a sermon preached by Luther in the year 1533, although it is well known that Luther treated the subject differently almost every time he touched it; and a wise old Lutheran theologian declares that in his day the adherents of the Augsburg Confession did not agree about the Descensus.*

(c) "Church Usages and Ceremonies," although no fault may be found with the teaching of this article. But all that it contains is embodied fundamentally in the Augsburg Confession.

(d) "Foreknowledge and Election," which Melancthon purposely kept out of the Confession as a tedious and inexplicable dispute, which could only disturb consciences,† and which, as a matter of fact, only within the last few years has given rise to one of the most bitter controversies ever known among Lutherans in this country.

2. It has developed and treated several articles of the Confession in a scholastic and particularistic way, and has sought to impart confessional character to the private

views of individuals and to the explanations of local schools.

(a) Oral manducation, or the eating by the mouth the true and natural body of Christ in the eucharist. This doctrine does not belong to generic and Catholic Lutheranism. It is not found in the Augsburg Confession, nor in the Apology, nor in Luther's Catechisms, nor in the Smalcald Articles, nor in the Wittenberg Concord, nor in several other official and numerous subscribed statements of Lutheran doctrine. "The fact is, therefore," says the late Dr. Krauth, "that the defining term 'by the mouth' cannot be demonstrated to be an essential part of the Lutheran confessional statement. Entire national bodies of Lutherans have existed for centuries, and now exist, who have no such expression in their Confessions."* It is indeed historically certain that the doctrine of oral manducation could not possibly have found place in the Augsburg Confession, since some of those who helped to compose the Confession did not hold the oral partaking of the body and blood of Christ, nor the partaking of the same by *unbelievers*, as witness the *Swabian Syngramma*, which even Luther endorsed with two laudatory prefaces. Moreover, the Form of Concord declares that all those are sacramentarians and fanatics, and cannot be admitted to fellowship, who will not believe that the true natural body of Christ is received *orally* by the *ungodly* and by the saints, by Judas as well as by St. Peter.

(b) In its doctrine of the *Will* it declares that "man can as little begin, work, or co-operate in spiritual matters, and in his own conversion, or regeneration, as a stone, a block, a clod. . . . He is worse than a block, because he is opposed and hostile to the will of God."† This many persons regard as inconsistent with a true philosophy of the will as revealed in consciousness, and as tending to destroy all personal responsibility in the matter of one's salvation, and as inconsistent with the doctrine of Divine grace as taught in Article XI. For if man is as a stone, a block, a statue, without mouth or eyes, as Article II. teaches, then he can be converted only by an act of *irresistible* grace, which Article XI. denies. It is well known that such distinguished Lutheran theologians as Thomasius and Stahl reject the terms which the Form of Concord applies to the will, and that Luthardt regards them as *unfortunate*.

(c) It teaches in the *Epitome* the *absolute*

* *Museus' Prael. in Epit. Form. Concordiae*, p. 313.
† *Corpus Reformatorum*, II., p. 547.

* *Conservative Reformation*, p. 462.
† *Form of Concord*, Art. II.

ubiquity of the human nature of Christ, thus predicating an infinite attribute of a finite nature. This doctrine was disapproved by Melancthon and denied by Chemnitz, one of the authors of the Form of Concord, who, with the Saxon churches generally, acknowledged only a potential presence (*volipresence*, *multipresence*) of the human nature of Christ, as is taught in The Solid Declaration. Thus the Form of Concord is affirmed to be in conflict with itself. "No marvel, then, that controversy arose between the framers of the Concord shortly after its publication."* It was because it taught the doctrine of the *absolute ubiquity* of the human nature of Christ, that the Form of Concord was rejected by the Helmsstädt divines.†

(d) It carries the doctrine of the *Communicatio Idiomatum*, which Melancthon rejected, and which Luther treated in different ways at different periods of his life, into the most refined subtleties of scholastic philosophy, and ends by virtually deifying the human nature of Christ. Luthardt declares it has "the form of an abstract construction," and that such a method of treatment does not sufficiently recognize the historical reality of the earthly human life of Jesus Christ."‡ The dogma also gave rise to a prolonged controversy between the universities of Giessen and Tübingen, the former defending *Kenotism*, and the latter *Krypticism*, which is based on the ubiquitarian theory—"an after-effect of the still remaining dissonances so laboriously concealed in the Form of Concord."§ Modern Lutheran divines, as Thomasius, Hofmann, Lieber, Gess, Luthardt, are *Kenotists*, and, therefore, have virtually or really departed from the Form of Concord, which is decidedly *Kryptic*. These are the principal reasons assigned by the theologians of the General Synod for *not* accepting the Form of Concord as a confession of faith. It is cheerfully admitted that the Form has great *theological* value, and, considering the age in which it was produced, that it is comparatively tranquil, judicious, moderate; yet it is maintained that it is too dogmatic, scholastic, polemical, to serve the purposes of a creed; that it separates without warrant two great heroes of the Reformation, entirely ignoring, and therefore proscribing, the one, while it exalts the other almost to the throne of infallibility, since it makes "a number of the strongest pas-

sages from writings published by Luther, in the time of controversy,"* decisive of the meaning of the Augsburg Confession, final in regard to the interpretation of Scripture, and *normative* of the faith of the Lutheran Church; that it is the work of men who had no vocation to meet a common external foe, nor to speak for future generations; that it laid the foundation for the cast-iron orthodoxy of the next century; that it was not accepted by many devout Lutherans of its own age;† that it was the occasion of hot disputes both within and without the Lutheran Church, and that even those in our own day who accept it and profess to hold it as their own particular confession, have nevertheless been engaged in the most violent strife about views of doctrine which each seeks to prove out of this very Form of Concord; that it presents minute explanations of doctrines and metaphysical distinctions which ought not to be made a test of soundness in the Lutheran faith, and of a man's right to be called and to be treated as a Lutheran; finally, that it sets forth a type of Lutheranism which was constructed under the influence of a system of philosophy which has yielded to a philosophy more fully imbued with the spirit of Protestantism, and which, because of its broader vision and its clearer insight into the nature of man and the being of God, is able to construct an Anthropology and a Christology more in harmony with the facts of consciousness and the teachings of Revelation.

But while such is the attitude of the General Synod toward the Form of Concord, she is perfectly willing that any person, even one within her own pale, may accept and hold it as *his own* understanding of *all* the doctrines it treats; she is not willing that it shall be imposed upon *her*, or that it shall be exacted as *her* understanding and explanation of the Augsburg Confession, which she so loyally subscribes, or that it shall be the occasion of driving any one of her children from her bosom.

In perfect accord with these statements is a recent official declaration of a well-known editor and theological professor (Dr. S. A. Ort) in the General Synod:

"The Form of Concord is a valuable contribution to theological literature, but is not the basis of the General Synod, and

* Dorner, *Hist. Person of Christ*, Div. II., vol. ii., p. 213.

† Dorner says: "The Form of Concord was not adopted in a large part of the lands of the Lutheran Confession, as in Denmark, Holstein, Pomerania, Anhalt, Hesse, the Palatinate of Zweibrücken, Brunswick, Nuremberg, etc. . . . Yet those who did not adopt it could not be deprived of the character of Lutheran, seeing that they maintained their greater freedom upon the basis of the earlier confessions."—*Hist. Prot. Theol.*, i., p. 383.

* Dorner, *Hist. Doct. Christ*, Div. II., vol. ii., p. 215.

† Walch's *Streitigkeiten*, iv., 303 et seq.

‡ Dogmatic, p. 190.

§ Dorner, *Hist. Prot. Theol.*, i., p. 368.

never will be. It fixes a certain type of Lutheranism. It expresses the development of the doctrine of the Word of God, exhibited in the Augsburg Confession, wrought out under the conceptions of scholastic philosophy. It is, hence, not a development for all time. The fulness of it is no larger than scholastic philosophy admits. For this reason the General Synod has always maintained that every age must make its own contribution to the development of the Augsburg Confession, and not be bound and limited by any form of development in a particular time and under the influence of a particular philosophy." (*Lutheran Evangelist*, February, 1891.)

II. THE GENERAL COUNCIL, which now numbers 927 ministers, 1574 congregations, and 265,188 members, began its organization in 1866, and completed it in 1867. The prime mover in the formation of this new general body was the Pennsylvania Synod, which had taken a leading part in the organization of the General Synod in 1820, had withdrawn from that body in 1823, had returned again in 1853, and had now withdrawn a second time in 1866, not because of doctrinal difference, but, as shown by its own published proceedings, on account of *parliamentary* ruling, and on account of the action of the General Synod in sustaining that ruling. This synod appointed a committee "to prepare and issue a fraternal address to all evangelical Lutheran synods, ministers, and congregations in the United States and Canadas, which confess the unaltered Augsburg Confession, inviting them to unite with us in a convention for the purpose of forming a Union of Lutheran Synods."* In response to this fraternal address representatives of thirteen Lutheran synods assembled at Reading, Pa., December 11th, 1866, and adopted certain "Principles of Faith and Church Polity," which were the next year embodied in the Constitution of the General Council. After premising that "the unity of the Church is witnessed to and made manifest in the solemn, public, and official confessions which are set forth, to wit: The generic unity of the Christian Church in the general creeds, and the specific unity of pure parts of the Christian Church in their specific creeds," the Constitution declares: "That confessions may be such a testimony of unity and bond of union, they must be accepted in every statement of doctrine in their own true, native, original, and only sense. Those who set

them forth and subscribe them, must not only agree to use the same words, but must use and understand those words in one and the same sense."* This declaration, applied to "the Unaltered Augsburg Confession in its original sense as throughout in conformity with the pure truth of which God's Word is the rule," and to all the other Lutheran confessional writings found in the Book of Concord (see above) since they are "pure and scriptural statements of doctrine," and "are all, with the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, in the perfect harmony of one and the same scriptural faith," furnishes the doctrinal basis of the "General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America."

By comparing the doctrinal basis of the General Council with that of the General Synod, it will readily appear why these two bodies are not one. The latter body stands on the broad Catholic Lutheran basis of the Augsburg Confession, the only generic creed of the Lutheran Church. The former has narrowed the generic basis by adding to it the later symbols, and especially the Form of Concord, which, as Dörner declares, "did not bring about peace in the Lutheran Church; it merely became the symbol of a majority of the Lutherans of Germany, who never conscientiously could, nor seriously desired to deny the Lutheran character to those churches which declined to accept it."†

But the high hopes raised that the General Council would effect a union between "all the Evangelical Lutheran synods which confess the Unaltered Augsburg Confession," were doomed to speedy disappointment. When the body met to perfect its organization in 1867 it found before it, as submitted by the large Joint Synod of Ohio, the following questions, commonly known as the "four points":

1. "What relation will this venerable body in the future sustain to Chiliasm?"
2. "Mixed communion?"
3. "The exchanging of pulpits with sectarians?"
4. "Secret or unchurchly societies?"‡

At the same time the large German Iowa Synod presented a paper involving the same points about communion and the interchange of pulpits, and declaring synodical resolutions as only *advisory*.

To these questions the General Council did not give an unequivocal answer. Rather did it *evade* them. It *could not*

* Minutes, 1866.

* Minutes, 1867, p. 20.

† Person of Christ, Div. II., vol. II., p. 200.

‡ Minutes, p. 12.

answer them, for it contained within its own bosom those who, as its records show, held the most directly opposite views, and, as was known, engaged in diverse practices in regard to all the "points" involved; and the same is true of it to-day.

The Joint Synod of Ohio was never again represented on the floor of the General Council, and the German Iowa Synod, through its representatives, felt itself "constrained to forego the privilege of a vote in the General Council," and has ever since retained only a quasi-connection with that body. And because of principles involved in the "four points," and for other reasons, the General Council, which had thirteen synods represented in its preliminary organization, and has received four or five since, now contains only eight synods—that is, it has retained less than one half of the synods that have from time to time been represented in its meetings.

Thus it appears from the history of the General Council that the professed unequivocal acceptance of all the symbolical writings by the most rigid and exclusive form of subscription, is not in itself a *practicable* basis of union of "all Evangelical Lutheran synods which confess the Unaltered Augsburg Confession." These symbolical writings must be *interpreted*, and it so happens that the interpretations of the wisest and most learned and most Lutheran doctors do not always agree about the "native, true, original, and only sense," of these writings, and, humanly speaking, it is not possible that they should agree in the interpretation of the Form of Concord, which is made up so largely of concessions and counter-concessions, of clauses and sentences and extracts from the private writings of Luther, interjected for the most part for the purpose of satisfying some "who were more Lutheran than Luther," and of quieting the objections of others, and which the very authors of the Form interpreted from the start, some in one way and some in another, each party maintaining that its own views had been recognized as the doctrine of the Church.*

III. THE SYNODICAL CONFERENCE (popularly known as the "Missourians," because it is an accretion round the Missouri Synod) was organized in the year 1872. In several spheres of Christian activity it is, perhaps, the most aggressive and wide-awake Lutheran body in this country, and is exceedingly zealous for "the pure doctrine." But its critics declare that its one-sided and

almost exclusive devotion to dogmatics and its consequent relative neglect of exegesis and history, must sooner or later bring about its dissolution. A professor in the Philadelphia Seminary (General Council) has recently characterized it thus:

"The Synodical Conference has failed to become, and probably never was intended to become, a general union of Lutheran synods in America. It has simply been a training school to prepare synods for being absorbed by Missouri. As an organization it has no significance for the future development of our Church. It has cut itself entirely loose from the historical development of the Lutheran Church in this country, and from that of the Church in Europe for the latter centuries. According to its conception, the Lutheran Church is a stream which, after becoming a mighty river, and running with wide sweep through a century, plunged underground, and for three centuries passed through a hidden channel (sending up a few springs here and there to mark its track), until at last it emerged into the light of day once more in this country, with the arrival on these shores of a devoted band of Saxon emigrants." (*Lutheran*, January 15th, 1891.)

The doctrinal basis of the Synodical Conference is stated in these words: "The Synodical Conference confesses the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the Word of God, and the Confession of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of 1580, called 'Concordia,' as its own,"*—meaning by "Concordia" the *entire* Book of Concord. Every candidate at his ordination declares: "I recognize the three œcumenical creeds of the Church—the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, and its Apology, the Smalcald Articles; the two Catechisms of Luther, and the Form of Concord as the pure, unadulterated explanation and statement of the Divine Word and will; I confess them as my own confessions, and will exercise my ministry unto the end faithfully and diligently according to them."† Seeing now that the doctrinal basis of the Missourians is *identical* as regards its content with that of the General Council—viz., the *entire* Book of Concord, and seeing further, that the form of subscription of each seems to be *absolute* and *unequivocal*, the wonder is that the two bodies had not long ago mingled into one. But, as already remarked, the symbolical books must be *interpreted*, and it is in the interpretation of these books, principally of the Form of

* See Dorner, *Person of Christ*, Div. II., vol. II., p. 215.

* Constitution.

† Liturgy, p. 240.

Concord, that the *chief* grounds of dissension lie.

Among "the false doctrines" which the Missourians charge upon the General Council are the following :

1. The exchange of pulpits with non-Lutheran ministers.
2. Open communion—that is, the admission of non-Lutherans to the Lord's table.
3. Toleration of secret or unchurchly societies, such as Free Masons, Odd Fellows, etc.
4. Chiliasm, Synergism, and the toleration of Calvinistic views of the Lord's Supper.
5. Church government, in that the General Council holds that synodical resolutions are *binding* on the congregations, while the Missourians maintain that such resolutions are only *advisory*. The same doctrinal errors, except the last named, the Missourians charge upon the General Synod. Especially are they displeased with the recognition given by the General Synod to "sectarians"—that is, any and all non-Lutherans.

Against the German Iowa Synod, which contains 45,700 members, the Missourians charge as "false doctrines" "the open questions"—that is, according to the definition of the Iowans, "questions about which there can be different understanding without church fellowship being thereby destroyed, as a question about which, in the *confessional writings of our Church*, no *symbolical decisions* have yet been laid down. Wherefore two views may exist together in our church."* The Missourians deny that there are any such questions for Lutherans, and point to Articles VII. and VIII. in the Augsburg Confession, and to the Smalcald Articles, Part III., Article XII., and declare : "In her confession our Church has recorded for all time what she believes, teaches, and confesses, for the very reason that no controversy may arise concerning the question what our Lutheran Church believes and confesses in reference to certain points, or that such controversy may at least be adjusted without difficulty. Thus, for instance, the Formula of Concord in its second part expressly declares as its object that in setting forth its views 'a public and positive testimony might be furnished, not only to those who are now living, but also to posterity, showing what the unanimous opinion and judgment of our churches were, and PERPETUALLY OUGHT TO BE, concern-

ing those controverted articles.'" (*Book of Concord*, New Market edition, p. 596.)*

Among these "open questions," according to the Iowans, are the following :

1. *Chiliasm*, which Missouri rejects in its subtle as well as in its grosser forms, while Iowa holds that not every form of Chiliasm is to be rejected.
2. *Antichrist*, Missouri affirming that the Roman Pontiff is Antichrist, while Iowa affirms that he is an individual yet to come.
3. *The Church*, Missouri holding that the Church is invisible, while Iowa holds that the Church has both a visible and an invisible side.

4. *The Ministry*, Missouri maintaining that "the holy ministry is the authority conferred by God through the congregation as possessor of the priesthood and of all ecclesiastical authority, to exercise in behalf of the congregation in a public way the rights of the priesthood."†

Iowa declares : "The theory of transference, according to which individual spiritual priests transfer to one from their midst for public use the rights belonging to themselves, is to be treated purely as a theological problem"‡—an open question.

5. *Subscription to the creeds of the Church*, Missouri maintaining that a person who subscribes to the creeds unequivocally, thereby declares his acceptance of all the doctrines contained in them, while Iowa declares that the doctrine to be of binding force must be expressly stated, and not only occasionally mentioned. Hence that distinction is to be made between the doctrines contained in the symbolical books.

Such, then, are the principal "false doctrines" alleged by the Missourians against the General Synod, the General Council, and the Iowans. It will be seen that not one of them touches the heart or centre of Lutheranism, but that they all belong to the periphery. A man is a *Lutheran* who holds the following chief Lutheran doctrines in contradistinction to their well-known Calvinistic and other theological antitheses : That salvation has its source in the paternal love of God ; that Jesus Christ, very God and very man, is the centre of the evangelical system, and died for the whole world of mankind ; that salvation is sincerely offered to all men who hear the Gospel ; that the cause of the condemnation of some who hear the Gospel is their own voluntary rejection of the offer of salvation ; that the Word and the sacraments offer grace to all alike, and actually convey grace to all who

* Erklärung des Ministeriums, 1850.

* Controversy on Predestination, p. 5.

† Walther's Kirche und Amt., p. 354.

‡ Minutes, 1875, p. 21.

receive them with faith; that the *entire Christ* is present in the eucharist; that original sin is truly sin, as against Pelagians, etc.; that justification is by grace for Christ's sake through faith alone, as against Roman Catholics; that all ministers of the Gospel, whether Presbyterially or Episcopally ordained, are *equal*, as against the views of *some* sacerdotally constituted churches. The man who holds these doctrines, as they are fundamentally laid down in the Augsburg Confession, is a *Lutheran*, and is entitled to be considered a Lutheran, and to have all the rights, privileges, and immunities of a Lutheran accorded him, even though he may not hold in regard to some *circumferential* doctrines, or views of doctrines, just as Luther and Melancthon held; or may not accept certain *explanations* of Lutheran doctrines contained in the Form of Concord, as of the Lord's Supper, of the Person of Christ, of free-will; since, as Dorner has well said, it cannot be shown that all the explanations of doctrines found in the Form of Concord are true and legitimate deductions from the Augsburg Confession. Moreover, it must never be forgotten, as already twice stated in this paper, that the Form of Concord did not become, even in Germany, a universally accepted creed of the Lutheran Church; and if such be its history in the land of its birth, and in an age of scholastic philosophy whose principles it applies to the solution of theological problems, much less can it be expected to bring union in a foreign land and in an age in which a different and a better philosophy is in the ascendant. It must be remembered, also, that it is an *explanation*—an explanation which terminated, indeed, for a time a course of development; but it can have only *historical* and *theological* significance as a guide in the development of our day, and in the solution of the questions which ever and anon arise out of the great primary Confession of the Lutheran Church, which from age to age must test this Confession anew out of the Word of God, and must ascertain its meaning from the concurrent or consentient teaching of its authors, whose works are quite as accessible to us as they were to the framers of the Form of Concord. Hence, as an *explanation*, made under the stress of local circumstances, and according to the conceptions of one age, it cannot rationally be applied as a test of true Lutheran character where the theological and philosophical environment is so entirely different. To do so is to say that this age shall reap no benefit and witness no expansion of the theologi-

cal horizon from three hundred years' operation of the Spirit in the witnessing, confessing Church. And that this is the proper conclusion in regard to the Form of Concord is demonstrated by the fact that those who seem to subscribe it most unequivocally as their *own confession*, and to regard it as in the "perfect harmony of one and the same scriptural faith" with the Augsburg Confession, and who make it and its theology pre-eminently the test of Lutheran character, do, as a matter of fact, stand apart in separate organizations, and impeach the Lutheran character of each other to the extent that they will neither commune nor exchange pulpits with each other, as witness particularly the large Joint Synod of Ohio, which, though professing to hold all the symbolical writings in the most rigid and unqualified sense, nevertheless refused to remain with the Synodical Conference because of diverse *interpretation* of the eleventh article of the Form of Concord, and refused to remain in the General Council, which it helped to organize, because of the "four points," which, if not arising directly out of the Form of Concord, are, nevertheless, closely connected with the narrowing and exacting spirit which it begets and fosters. Thus it appears that the Form of Concord, great and valuable as it is when viewed from the standpoint of *history* and *theology*, because it narrows the original basis of Lutheranism from the generic to the specific and particularistic, is nevertheless directly associated with, if it be not the chief cause, of Lutheran dissension in this country. Or, if it should seem harsh to state the case in this *positive* form, it is at least very certain that it has not contributed *anything* to the production of an irenic spirit, and to the formation and continuation of organic union, and for the full proof of this we have only to appeal to the history of the last thirty years. At the breaking out of the late Civil War, which drew off the Southern synods, some thirty synods, extending from New York to Texas, from the Atlantic to the Missouri River, were harmoniously united in the General Synod. Every Synod east of the Ohio River, with one or two insignificant exceptions, and most of those west of it, were in connection with the General Synod. The few remaining Form of Concord synods were as much at war with each other as they were with the General Synod. Men of different languages and various nationalities met together in the general body and recognized each other as Lutherans, on the basis of the Augsburg Confession.

This happy condition of affairs was thus described by the late Dr. C. P. Krauth, Jr.: "There are not only not distinct genera, there are no distinct species in the General Synod. There is but one class, one species in it, and all the differences are simply those of varieties in one species. The true friends of the General Synod have this specific mark, that, setting aside non-fundamentals as terms of ministerial union and of church fellowship, they meet as on fundamentals; and setting aside the minutiae of the mere technical phraseology of one or two features in one or two doctrines, they meet in harmony on their substance."*

But about this time the spirit of the Form of Concord entered, and with it came the spirit of *schism*, which rent the General Synod in twain and carried away thousands of her members to be united in a new body on the basis of the *entire* Book of Concord, some of them to withdraw after a few years, that they might enter *newer* combinations of still narrower and more exclusive character, where the distinctions of fundamentals and non-fundamentals are unknown, and where "the minutiae of the mere technical phraseology of doctrines" are exalted to the position of confessional importance. In a word, the history of three hundred years ago has repeated itself, but with this difference only, that the scene of strife and division has been transferred from Germany to America.

We now advance to the consideration of the most important single ground of Lutheran dissension. The reader will recall that in the main it is the Missourians who have charged "false doctrines" against the other Lutheran bodies. In what follows, Missouri becomes the offender. About twenty years ago the Rev. Dr. Walther, Professor of Theology in the Seminary of the Missourians at St. Louis, startled the Lutheran theological world by an extreme, if not altogether *new*, interpretation of the eleventh article of the Form of Concord, "Of God's Foreknowledge and Election." For the purpose of exalting the majesty of the grace of God in salvation as over against modern Pelagian and Synergistic views, he declared that predestination or election is the *cause* of salvation. Under controversy, Dr. Walther, whose views are now the views of the Missourians, stated the case thus: "It consists simply in the following twofold question: (1) *Whether God from eternity, before the foundations of the world were laid, out of pure mercy and only for the sake of*

*the most holy merit of Christ, elected and ordained the chosen children of God to salvation and whatever pertains to it, consequently also to faith, repentance, and conversion; or (2) whether, in His election, God took into consideration anything good in man—namely, the foreseen conduct of man, the foreseen non-resistance, and the foreseen persevering faith, and thus elected certain persons to salvation in consideration of, with respect to, on account of, or in consequence of their conduct, their non-resistance, and their faith. The first of these questions we affirm, while our opponents deny it; but the second question we deny, while our opponents affirm it."**

We note the following points in the discussion:

1. Dr. Walther defends his position *exclusively* from the Form of Concord, and charges that his opponents defend their position from the private writings of the Lutheran theologians *subsequent* to the Form of Concord.

2. He maintains that in the Form of Concord the doctrine of predestination is applied in "a *stricter* sense," and "is understood to be that which extends only to the children of God who have been chosen and ordained to eternal life before the foundation of the world," while his opponents, he declares, understand predestination in "a *wider* sense" as "that doctrine which comprises the general doctrine of the way to salvation for all men as a part, even as the first or chief part; or one which is nothing else than that general doctrine of the way to salvation for all men."

3. Dr. Walther makes election the *cause* of salvation, quoting the Form of Concord very emphatically thus: "THE ETERNAL ELECTION OF GOD NOT ONLY FORESEES AND FOREKNOWS THE SALVATION OF THE ELECT, BUT THROUGH HIS GRACIOUS WILL AND GOOD PLEASURE IN CHRIST JESUS, IS ALSO A CAUSE WHICH PROCURES, WORKS, AIDS, AND PROMOTES OUR SALVATION AND WHATEVER PERTAINS TO IT." The position of his opponents he declares "to be nothing more than the following: In the first place, the *foreknowledge* of God that certain persons will receive the Gospel in true faith and persevere in this saving faith unto the end; and secondly, the *decree* that He will actually save the persons that thus persevere in faith."

4. Dr. Walther states in his own words as the proper meaning of the Form of Concord, that predestination is "a CAUSE of

* *Lutheran and Missionary*, March 31, 1864.

* *Controversy on Predestination*, p. 5.

the salvation of the elect," and is "also a cause of faith," and that his opponents regard faith as "a cause of predestination."

It will thus be seen that the two views are clearly antagonistic the one to the other. What one party regards as a *cause* the other party regards as an *effect*, and *vice versa*. Dr. Walther and the Missourians charge that their opponents are "not Lutheran," are "Pelagian;" and they charge that Dr. Walther and the Missourians are "Calvinistic;" and in support of their charge they quote from the official declarations of the Missourians, passages like the following: "The difference between the Calvinistic and Lutheran doctrine of Predestination is this: The Lutherans do not wish to explain how it comes about that it all depends on the mercy of God that in the case of some opposition and death are removed, but that others remain lost. The Lutherans dismiss this question; but the Calvinists answer it," etc.

The position of the chief opponents of Missouri on Free Will, Conversion, and Predestination are thus presented by Professor G. Fritschel, of the German Iowa Synod:

1. "Over against all these predestinarian inclinations must be strongly emphasized the fact of the *personal self-determination of man for or against salvation*."

2. "That of two men who hear the Gospel, opposition and death are removed in the case of one and not in the case of the other . . . *has its ground in the free self-determination of the man, although this itself is possible only by grace*."

3. "That of two men to whom the Gospel is preached, the one comes to faith, the other does not, according to God's Word is due solely and alone to the decision of the man."

4. "Whether a man shall be saved or lost rests in its final ground on the *FREE self-determination of man for or against grace*."

5. "It is certain that since God appoints only a number of men to eternal life, the ground of this lies either in the absolute election of God, who now but once only presents man with faith, or in the decision of the man foreseen by God."

6. "The doctrine of our Lutheran dogmatists, that God has elected those whose faith in Christ He foresaw, is not Pelagian, but is a sound doctrine in full accord with the Word of God."*

It needs no very great intellectual acumen to discover that these two sets of theses

are fundamentally and irreconcilably antagonistic to each other. It is not possible to harmonize Professor Fritschel's "personal self-determination of men," "final ground," "foreseen faith," with the "predestination is the CAUSE of salvation," "without foreseen faith," "election is *particular*," of Dr. Walther and the Missourians. Yet each party to the dispute professes *unqualified* acceptance of the Form of Concord, and finds in it support for its own view of predestination. And we leave to the metaphysician the task of reconciling Professor Fritschel's "personal self-determination of man" with the Form of Concord's simile of "a block, a stone, or a clod."

But besides the German Iowa Synod, a Norwegian Synod, and the Joint Synod of Ohio have violently controverted the predestinarian doctrine of Missouri, and have withdrawn from the Synodical Conference into independence. The General Synod has taken no part in the controversy; neither has the General Council, as such, although the faculty of the Philadelphia Seminary has delivered an "Opinion concerning the Dogma of Predestination."* This "Opinion" shows that the older Lutheran theologians "used expressions of a strongly deterministic character implying an absolute predestination;" it declares that the Form of Concord "rejects those deterministic and ultra-predestinarian tendencies of the earlier Lutheran theologians;" it holds that the later Lutheran theologians gave a larger place to faith as a cause in the election of the individual, saying, "That under this aspect faith enters into the Divine purpose of predestination as the actual condition of the application of general election to the individual. In this sense they speak of an election '*intuitu fidei*,' '*ex prævisa fide*,' and of faith as '*causa minus principalis, instrumentalis, conditio, electionis*,'" etc.

The "Opinion" is cautious, and, in general, non-committal, though, as it inclines to support the view of the later theologians, it goes against the position of Missouri. It admits "that the terms '*intuitu fidei*,' '*ex prævisa fide*,' and similar ones, do not present a satisfactory solution of the theological problem in question," but it also declares that the views of the older theologians "at no time represented the *Confession of the Lutheran Church*."

Here again will be seen the divisive influence of the Form of Concord. The Missourians, headed by very learned men, in-

* *Theologische Monatshefte*, 187, passim.

* *Lutheran Church Review*, 1884, p. 223 et seq.

interpret it as being in harmony with the deterministic and high predestinarian views of the earliest Lutheran theologians, and declare that election is a *cause* (sometimes they write it the *cause*) of salvation and all that pertains thereunto, without regard to *foreseen faith*. The Philadelphia divines declare that it is a "misconception" "to attempt to interpret the Form of Concord in the sense of our earlier theologians," or to place the terms *foreseen faith*, *in view of faith*, "in conflict with the Confession"—that is, with the Form of Concord—which is to declare that the Missourians are in harmony with the older divines, and that the later divines are not in harmony with the older, and that the Form of Concord, since it rejects determinism and ultra-predestination, and does not mention the terms "*in view of faith*," "*foreseen faith*," falls *somewhere* between—that is, the Form of Concord, before it can become a *practicable* basis of Lutheran union, must have just what it itself *claims* to be—viz., an *authoritative explanation*. For here we see one party declares that it condemns the very thing which the other affirms that it makes certain—viz., *predestination, determinism, salvation, and all that pertains thereunto, without regard to foreseen faith*.

But of highest importance is the following statement of the Philadelphia divines: "It is a historical fact that the earlier Lutheran Confessions, the Catechisms, Augustana, Apology, and Smalcald Articles, so far from sanctioning any of these views of the above-mentioned theologians (the older divines), avoid any direct reference to the subject of predestination, and certainly do not teach an absolute predestination or determinism. Up to the time of the Formula of Concord there is no really official statement and consensus of the Lutheran Church on this difficult and perplexing doctrine." If, now, this be true, as undeniably it is, then it cannot be said that the Form of Concord sets forth none other system of doctrine and articles of faith than the Augsburg Confession; nor can it be said that the Form has not introduced into the Lutheran Confession an article which we know was *intentionally* left out of the earlier confessions; nor can it be said that the Form is not intended to make binding upon consciences and determinative of Lutheran character for all time, a *phase* of a doctrine, or an *explanation* of a doctrine, of which doctrine the very authors of the Form declare: "No public controversy has arisen among the theologians of the Augsburg Confession concerning this article." Hence,

in view of the foregoing facts, it is altogether pertinent to inquire: Would it not have been better had the second generation of Reformers imitated the prudent caution and wise reserve of the first, especially since the very thing they sought to prevent—viz., "offensive disputation," has been caused *directly* by this article? and would it not be better if Lutherans of the present day would cease to judge and to test each other by the dogmatic, scholastic, and particularistic phraseology of the Form of Concord, whose history has been a history of strife and division?

Thus have we sought with calmness and fairness to lay before the reader, as based on official documents and the testimony of standard writers, a statement of the chief grounds of Lutheran dissension. If he has given even moderately close attention, he has not failed to observe how large a place the Form of Concord occupies among these grounds. As an extreme, and in some articles a one-sided development of Lutheranism—it is generally regarded as a triumph of the "Swabian School"—it not only has failed to determine the true *generic* Lutheranism, but it has provided the material for subsequent disputes, and has fostered a disputatious, dogmatic, intolerant spirit, which is impatient of contradiction, and demands agreement in every circumferential point of doctrine, and in all "the minutiae of technical phraseology" as the first and final condition of Lutheran union; for it cannot be denied that Lutherans stand divided to-day mainly on *points* of doctrine, either expressly inculcated, or clearly implied, in the Form of Concord; nor can it be denied that when gnesio-Lutherans fall into disputes about Lutheran doctrines, they invariably seek to settle them mainly by appeal to the Form of Concord, all of which goes to show that in America, as in Germany, in the nineteenth century, as in the sixteenth, the Form of Concord is *not* a *practicable* basis of Lutheran union; that the only *practicable* basis of Lutheran union is the Augsburg Confession, accepted and held in good faith with toleration and charity on the one side for all those who adopt as their *own faith* all the explanations and minute phraseology of the later symbols, and with toleration and charity on the other side by those same persons for all who accept the Augustana in good faith, but are not willing to be bound by all the aforesaid explanations and phraseology. Within these limits there is ample room for the exercise of private judgment round the periphery of Lutheranism, and for the practice of that

charity which "beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things."

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

THE SEPTUAGINT AS RELATED TO NEW TESTAMENT INSPIRATION.

BY MARVIN R. VINCENT, D.D.

THE Septuagint is the first step of the Hebrew race into the world of Greek literature—the first timber in the bridge which spans the gap between the Old and the New Testament. With the Septuagint we have entered upon a period when the Jew could venture to translate his sacred literature out of the holy tongue into the language of profane culture. Greek literature now began to feel the contact of the mental acquisitions of the East. The faith and the history of Israel passed into Greek literary forms, and thus became accessible to the world. Hellenic influences modified the Pharisaic rigidity of Judaism, and made it more cosmopolitan without impairing its monotheism. The Septuagint and the Apocryphal literature which succeeded it, made Hellenists better acquainted with their own past, and exposed the folly of heathenism through the medium of its choicest tongue. Hellenism thus served the double purpose of strengthening Jewish conviction and making it more elastic.

"Hellenistic Judaism," says Schürer, "is as inconceivable without the Septuagint as the Evangelical Church of Germany without Luther's Bible."

The Septuagint is the work of different authors and of different times. Its oldest portion is the Pentateuch, published some time in the third century B.C. The date commonly assigned is 283-247.

Translations of the Prophets and of the Hagiographa followed, originating mostly in Egypt. Some portions were not composed until the Maccabean era (168-106 B.C.).

Its character differs in the different books. The qualifications of the translators evidently varied greatly. It is thought that the work of at least fifteen hands can be detected. The best portions are Leviticus and Proverbs. The prophets are often quite unintelligible. The translation of Daniel was entirely supplanted by the later version of Theodotion, and exists in only a single MS., which was discovered at Rome in 1772.

The translation was universally accepted

by the Jews of the dispersion. The oldest Hellenists, Demetrius and Eupolemus, in their compilations, rely solely upon it. Philo assumes it throughout, and maintains that the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures must be admired and revered as one and the same, both in the facts and in the words. All his arguments from Scripture are based upon it. Josephus likewise assumes it for the most part.

That it was used as Holy Scripture in the synagogue service is attested by Justin Martyr and Tertullian, though it may have been that the Scriptures were read in both Hebrew and Greek on such occasions, as the Emperor Justinian declared that he had heard them in his time.

It was transferred to the Christian Church, and used as the authentic text of Scripture.

This fact acted to bring it into discredit with the Jews. When they began to find that it furnished weapons to Christian controversialists, they took a dislike to it, and are said to have instituted a fast to deplore its existence, as they had originally instituted a feast to celebrate it. Their most orthodox rabbis declared that the translation of the sacred law was a crime, and a misfortune as bad for Israel as the day on which the golden calf was made.

The Septuagint was regarded by Hellenistic Jews as the sacred text of Scripture down to the beginning of the second century after Christ. Soon after, Hellenistic Judaism began to yield to rabbinical pressure and to the advance of Christianity. A symptom of its retrogression appeared in the new Greek translations of the Bible, the object of which was to furnish the Greek-speaking Jews with a text in conformity with the authorized Hebrew, to serve as a weapon in the controversies with Christian theologians like Justin, who were using the existing text effectively against Jewish opponents.

Three of these translations were made: by Aquila, a Jewish proselyte; by Theodotion, and by Symmachus, an Ebionite Christian. Aquila adhered slavishly to the original; Theodotion and Symmachus adopted a mean between the paraphrastic looseness of the original Septuagint and the literalness of Aquila. Aquila's translation remains only in the fragments of Origen's Hexapla preserved in patristic quotations. Theodotion's has met with the same fate, with the exception of his version of Daniel, which supplanted the original Septuagint version, and has come down to us complete. The translation of Symmachus, which appears to have been distinguished for supe-

rior elegance and perspicuity, has also disappeared.

The deviations thus occasioned led Origen to the preparation of his "Hexapla," which contained the Hebrew text in Hebrew, and also in Greek characters; and the translations of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus. In order to facilitate the use of the LXX text, he noted in the text itself the variations from the Hebrew by marking such words, sentences, or paragraphs as were missing in the Hebrew with a dagger as the sign of erasure, and by interpolating, with the addition of an asterisk, from other translations, mostly from Theodotion, those which were found in the Hebrew and missing in the original Septuagint.

The Septuagint translation in use in the time of Christ and of the apostles was, therefore, far from being a faithful rendering of the original Hebrew. It was rather a corrected edition, a running commentary, freely manipulating the text according to the exegetical traditions of the day. This fact lends some countenance to the theory that it was originally based, in part, at least, not upon the actual Hebrew text, but upon the expository targums used in the synagogue readings.

It is full of intentional as well as of unintentional departures from the original. The unintentional errors arose from the use of an unpunctuated text; from the non-existence of vowel-points; from confusion of letters, as *Daleth* and *Resh*; from ignorance of proper names, and from not understanding difficult words. The intentional variations showed the influence of Gentile contact. The translators did not hesitate at times to sacrifice the literal and natural sense to the current view of their day. They toned down the bold anthropomorphisms of the earlier books out of deference to a refined culture. They suggested an occasional parallel between Jewish and Christian ordinances, as when they rendered *Urim* and *Thummim* by *δήλωσις* and *ἀλήθεια* (*manifestation* and *truth*), thus intimating a resemblance between the gems on the priestly breastplate and the sapphire *Thmei* or *truth* worn by the Egyptian priests. They introduced the classical legend of Amaltheia, the fabled nurse of Zeus, into their rendering of the name of Job's daughter, Keren-Happuch (*horn of the face-paint*), which they translate Ἀμλθαίας κέρας (*the horn of Amaltheia*), used by the Greeks as a symbol of abundance. They substituted Greek proverbs for Hebrew ones. Thus, in 1 Kings 20 : 11 (LXX. 21), instead of "Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast

himself as he that putteth it off," they read, "Let not the crooked boast himself as the straight" (*μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ κυρτὸς ὡς ὁ ὀρθός*).

They introduced rabbinic legends, as in Deut. 32 : 8, for "He set bounds to the people according to the number of the children of Israel," they read "According to the number of the angels of God." In Josh. 24 : 30 they inserted that the flint knives used for circumcision in the wilderness had been buried in Joshua's grave.

They omit phrases or words which appear to reflect unfavorably upon their national heroes or their national character. Thus they omit "leprous" in Exod. 4 : 6 of Moses's hand when he took it out of his bosom. They throw out Exod. 32 : 9, "I have seen this people, and behold it is a stiff-necked people." In Exod. 30 : 22, instead of "Thou knowest this people, that they are set on mischief," they read, "Thou knowest the impetuosity of this people."

The effect produced by the translation and by the tradition of its inspired character, and of the miracle of its composition, is seen in the comments of Philo and of the Fathers upon mistakes which they accept as inspired.

Thus Jer. 11 : 19, where the Hebrew reads, "Let us destroy the tree with the bread (*i.e.*, fruit) thereof," the LXX. has ἐμβάλλωμεν ξύλον εἰς τὸν ἄρτον αὐτοῦ : "Let us cast the wood into his bread." The Fathers interpreted this absurdity to mean, "Let us cast the cross into the body of Christ;" and Jerome says that this application is given by consent of all the Church. This is followed by Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen, and Theodoret.

In Hab. 2 : 11 (Hebrew), "The beam out of the timber shall answer it," the LXX. renders *kaphis* (Targum, *splinter*) by the strange word *κάνθαρος*, a beetle, which may possibly mean a knot in the wood. The translators may have read for *kaphis*—*haphash*, "a beetle." At any rate, Ambrose speaks of "Him who like a beetle called to His persecutors," and says, "Christ was the good beetle who called from the wood."

Hab. 3 : 2 (Hebrew) : "O Lord, I have heard the report of Thee and am afraid. O Lord, revive Thy work in the midst of the years." LXX. : "O Lord, I heard Thy fame, and I was afraid. I beheld Thy works and I was astonished. In the midst of two animals Thou shalt be recognized" (ἐν μέσῳ δύο ζώων γνωσθήσῃ).

In the "two animals" Origen sees the *Son* and the *Spirit*; Tertullian, *Moses* and *Elias*; others, the *cherubim* and *seraphim*; *Jews* and *Babylonians*; the *two thieves*;

the two
is an a
mange
reprod
Befo
tions o
that w
which
presen
overco
Tha
nearly
Old T
of the
A d
sible.
which
Our
of ab
On
some
the w
been
mater
gint
plaris
furth
sions
Ur
as in
back
MS.
cepte
super
Test
Pr
senti
cent
com
It se
of th
scrib
as o
no v
have
that
astr
sent
apo
T
edit
bric
pas
are
V
the
Wh
qu
Sep
in
the

the two testaments. Augustine thinks there is an allusion to the *ox and the ass* at the manger in Bethlehem, and that idea has reproduced itself in Christian art.

Before we come to the Septuagint quotations of the New Testament, it is only fair that we should speak of a serious difficulty which confronts us, and which, with our present knowledge, we are unable wholly to overcome.

That is, the answer to the question, How nearly can we discover the Greek text of the Old Testament of the time of Christ, and of the Apostles?

A discussion of that problem here is impossible. It is, however, much the same as that which meets us in the New Testament text.

Our earliest MS. sources for both texts are of about the same date.

Only, in the case of the LXX., we have some special complications growing out of the work of Origen, whose insertions have been confounded by scribes with the original material, so that the chief task of Septuagint textualism is the exclusion of hexaplarian additions. The confusion has been further heightened by the subsequent recensions of Herveychius and Lucian.

Under these circumstances we are obliged, as in the case of the New Testament, to fall back upon what we can get. The Vatican MS. of the fourth century is generally accepted by the best critics as having the superior claim to giving a genuine Old Testament text.

Professor Toy says: "The Vatican, representing the best LXX. text of the fourth century of our era, will, in all probability, come nearest to the text of the first century. It seems to have escaped the manipulation of the harmonizers, and, so far as ordinary scribal errors are concerned, it is true of it, as of the New Testament Vatican text, that no very important corruptions are likely to have crept in during the three centuries that preceded it. . . . We shall not go far astray if we take the Vatican MS. as representing substantially the Septuagint of the apostles and evangelists."

This text is the basis of the latest critical edition of the LXX. by Dr. Swete, of Cambridge; and it is certain that many of the passages of our best New Testament text are in verbal agreement with it.

We come, then, to the quotations from the Septuagint in the New Testament. What is their character? Are they literal quotations in verbal agreement with the Septuagint? and does the Septuagint itself, in the passages quoted, always agree with the Hebrew?

Here I must be content with a very few illustrations of facts which any student can easily verify for himself, but the details of which would far exceed the limits of this paper.

Of these passages some agree with both the Hebrew and the LXX.; some with the LXX. and not with the Hebrew. These are the most numerous; some with the Hebrew and not with the LXX.; some with neither.

Of 275 quotations made by Christ and the apostles, 90 agree verbally with the LXX.; and in 37 of the 90, the LXX. differs from the Hebrew.

In the quotations ascribed to Jesus Himself, more than half are introduced by "It is written," or some similar formula, indicating that they are given as formal quotations. A considerable number are given without any such formula, as in Matt. 24, where there is a cluster of them; or in Matt. 5, in the Beatitudes, where either various passages are summed up in a condensed statement, or the passages partake more of the nature of references than of quotations. In Matt. 13:14, 15, our Lord cites a passage from the LXX. which betrays the disposition of the LXX. translators to soften down uncongenial utterances. The citation is from Isa. 6:9, 10, where the Hebrew reads: "Make this people's understanding gross and their ears dull and their eyes dim." The LXX. changes to "This people's heart has become gross, and they have heard heavily."

They were averse to ascribing the hardening of the heart, as in the Hebrew, to the direct agency of God. John, however, cites the same passage, retaining the Hebrew form of the *idea*: "He has blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts," but varying *verbally*, both from the LXX. and the Hebrew (John 12:40).

To any one who is not dominated by the idea of a strict and literal verbal inerrancy, the LXX. quotations of our Lord will not present any difficulty. They exhibit numerous verbal differences; but the meaning of the LXX. text is always distinctly conveyed.

The quotations of the evangelists themselves and of the apostles present more marked variations in a few cases. Thus in Matt. 12:18-21; Isa. 42:1-4 is cited, in words which agree with neither the Hebrew nor the LXX.

The *Hebrew* is: "Behold my servant on whom I lay hold (or whom I uphold), my chosen, in whom my soul delights."

LXX.: "Jacob is my servant, I will lay hold on him. Israel is my chosen, my soul has accepted him."

Matt. : "Behold my servant whom I have chosen, my beloved in whom my soul is well pleased."

Hebrew and LXX. : "He shall not cry."

Matt. : "He shall not *strive* nor cry."

Hebrew : "Unto truth he shall send forth judgment." *LXX.* substantially the same.

Matt. : "Send forth judgment unto victory."

Matt. 21 : 13 : "My house shall be called a house of prayer ; but ye make it a den of thieves."

Mark. 11 : 17 : "My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations ; but ye have made it a den of robbers."

Luke 19 : 46 : "My house is the house of prayer ; but ye have made it a den of thieves."

Hebrew and LXX. (*Isa.* 56 : 7) : "My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the peoples."

Here we see that the three evangelists quote the passage differently. That Matthew varies from both *LXX.* and *Hebrew* by omitting "for all nations." That all three insert the "den of thieves," which is not in the *Hebrew* nor *LXX.* of *Isaiah*, but is found in both *Hebrew* and *LXX.* of *Jer.* 7 : 12, "Has this house, on which my name is called, become in your eyes a den of robbers?" The evangelists combine *Isaiah* and *Jeremiah*, and change *Jeremiah's* interrogative form.

Acts 7 : 3 in Stephen's speech : "The God of glory appeared to our father Abraham when he was in Mesopotamia before he settled in Haran."

This is according to the *LXX.* ; but the *Hebrew* represents Abraham as *setting out* from Haran.

Acts 8 : 33, from *Isa.* 53 : 8 : "In His humiliation His judgment was taken away ; His generation who shall declare ; for His life is taken from the earth."

This is an accurate rendering of the *LXX.*, but the *Hebrew* differs widely from the *LXX.* : "By violence and by judgment He was taken away, and for His generation, who considered that He was cut off from the land of the living?"

Rom. 10 : 15 : "How beautiful are the feet of them that bring glad tidings of good things" (*Isa.* 52 : 7).

Hebrew : "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him who brings tidings, who announces peace, who brings tidings of good."

LXX. : "I am present as beauty on the mountains, as the feet of him who announces good tidings of peace, as one who announces good tidings of good."

Thus the *LXX.* does not agree with the *Hebrew*, and Paul agrees (literally) with neither.

1 *Cor.* 2 : 9 : "Things which eye saw not and ear heard not, and which entered not into the heart of man ; whatsoever things God prepared for them that love Him."

Hebrew : "From of old men have not heard, not perceived with the ear, eye has not seen a God beside Thee who does (gloriously) for him who waits on Him."

LXX. : "From of old we have not heard, nor have our eyes seen a God beside Thee, and Thy works which Thou wilt do for those who wait for Thy name."

Thus the *LXX.* gives a free translation of the *Hebrew*, and Paul a free and expanded rendering of the *LXX.*

Some other noteworthy examples may be found in 1 *Cor.* 14 : 21 ; 15 : 24 ; 15 : 55 ; *Eph.* 4 : 8 ; *Heb.* 1 : 6, in which last passage the words, "And let all the angels of God worship Him," do not occur in the *Hebrew*, but are cited literally from the *LXX.*

What, then, is the bearing of these facts upon the question of inspiration ?

That will depend very much upon what we understand by "inspiration." From one point of view the *LXX.* quotations in the New Testament will present a very troublesome and, as I think, an utterly insoluble problem. From another point of view they will afford, as it seems to me, no serious difficulty, but will rather prove to be illustrative and confirmatory. This question will necessarily lead us into some general discussion.

Any sound theory and correct definition of the word and idea of inspiration must be the resultant of an induction from facts, and must include all the facts. These facts, moreover, are those furnished by *Scripture itself.* We have no other reliable source of information. It is a thoroughly unscientific, illegitimate and fallacious process to postulate *à priori* what inspiration must be—how God must have communicated His written revelation, and then to force the facts into agreement with this hypothesis. The history of science furnishes abundant illustrations of the viciousness of this process. So long as men started with the assumption that the earth was flat, that the earth was the centre of the universe, that the sun moved round the earth, that the planets revolved in circular orbits, because the circle was the most perfect curve, and endeavored to reconcile the obvious facts of nature with these assumptions, so long they reached false conclusions and perpetrated absurdities.

The fallacy of this method, as applied to Divine revelation, was long ago exposed by Bishop Butler, when he showed the untenableness of the criteria that a revelation from God *must* be universal; that it *could* not be confined to an obscure and insignificant people; that it *could* not be encumbered with difficulties of interpretation, and that its evidence *must* be such as to leave no room for doubt.

"There is no essential difference," says Professor Sanday, "between the claim which was then made for the revelation itself and the claim which is still made for the Book in which that revelation is embodied—viz., that it must be, *in all respects, infallible*; whereas neither its text, its grammar, nor its science is infallible."

Moreover, it must be noted that this process cuts both ways. That is to say, if the defenders of revelation may be allowed to lay down *a priori* criteria of revelation, the same right cannot be denied to its opponents, and the basis of the controversy is shifted from an actual to a possible revelation. The result of this would be, and has been, to draw attention from the actual to the possible revelation—from the actual to the possible Bible. Our only safe principle is that *inspiration is consistent with the phenomena of Scripture*. Our fundamental question is not, "*What is and what is not consistent with inspiration?*"

Scripture does not define the nature and extent of its own inspiration. The often-cited passage, 2 Tim. 3 : 16, really gives us no light on that point. Suppose we concede the interpretation upon which many insist—"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God"—the question still confronts us, "What is inspiration of God?" The passage does indeed point out certain *effects* which attend the use of inspired writings. They prove themselves profitable for teaching, for reproof or confutation, for setting to rights, for discipline in righteousness, and generally for fitting a man of God for every good work. Perhaps we may safely say that any writing or collection of writings which will do all that, may be held to have come from God, and to exhibit the in-breathing of His Spirit; but, after all, we are no nearer than ever to all answer to the question, *What is inspiration?* These statements do not give us any light on whether it is verbal, literally inerrant, dynamic, plenary. They tell us merely *what a writing into which God's Spirit has been breathed will do*, and we are all agreed as to that.

So that we must fall back on the facts,

on the phenomena of the Bible as we have it. Our discussion confines us to one class of facts. Our question is: Does this class of facts—the Old Testament citations from the Greek LXX. in the New Testament—bear out the theory of a verbally inerrant inspiration?

Let me briefly summarize the facts. The New Testament writers quote from the LXX. They quote in many—perhaps the majority of instances—freely, without regard to strict verbal accuracy.

Some of these verbally inaccurate quotations are put by the evangelists into the mouth of our Lord Himself.

In many cases there are marked differences between the LXX. and the original Hebrew, and the quotation adheres to the former and not to the latter.

The LXX. is sometimes cited in the form in which it mistranslates or imperfectly translates the Hebrew.

In certain cases the New Testament citation agrees with neither Hebrew nor LXX. In a few instances, one of which is ascribed to our Lord by John (7 : 38), preceded by the words, "As the Scripture hath said," the quotation cannot be identified in either Hebrew or LXX.

Now upon such facts as these I have not a moment's hesitation in affirming that the theory of verbal inerrancy shivers hopelessly into pieces. No possible exercise of ingenuity can reconcile such facts with such a theory.

This matter of New Testament citation bears directly upon the question, because the theory of inerrant, verbal inspiration carries with it as its corollary the fact of inerrant transmission. That is to say, that theory assumes that verbal inerrancy is God's own ideal of inspiration; that when God undertook to give a written revelation to the world, He deemed it essential and imperative that that revelation should be verbally accurate. That being the case, it is for the advocates of that theory to explain how it is that God has never carried out this ideal; that, assuming that He gave this revelation originally in inerrant autographs, the human race from the beginning has never had the benefit of that inerrant, autographic revelation; that no Divine superintendence has intervened to prevent the errors of copyists and type-setters; that all MSS. of the New Testament earlier than the fourth century have been hopelessly lost; that differences in the New Testament text appear as early as Tatian's Diatessaron, and between Clement of Alexandria and Irenæus; that the earliest New

Testament MSS. in our possession show the corrections of later hands; and that the most searching, scholarly criticism of modern times has left an eighth of the words of the New Testament still open to criticism.

Moreover, that in the transmission of the Old Testament Scriptures to a Greek-speaking race, many of whom had no possible access to the sacred writings except through the LXX. version, no divine superintendence prevented the LXX. translators from changing and omitting the original words, or overruled their ignorance to prevent their making mistakes, and, in some cases, rendering the words of inspiration unintelligible.

But, it is said, we are not certain about the original Hebrew text. There may have been another text which, if discovered, would verify the renderings of the LXX. and New Testament.

To which it may be said :

1. That, granting the possibility, it is *only* a possibility, and that, not having the other text, we can base no conclusions upon it. We are forced to form our conclusions from the comparison of the texts which we have.

2. That that possibility does not help us in cases where the LXX. and the New Testament disagree.

3. That the assumption of another text followed by the LXX. is fatal to the inerrant, verbal inspiration of our *present* Hebrew text. We save the LXX. at the expense of the Hebrew.

Again, we are offered a sweeping and comprehensive relief in the doctrine of the *originally inerrant autographs*. Grant that discrepancies and even errors occur in our present texts, the *original autographs were verbally inerrant*. If we could recover these, all these blemishes would disappear.

With all respect for those who hold this view, and who seriously urge it as a reason why we should assert the verbal inerrancy of Scripture, I must say that this appeals to me as the most shadowy and the coldest piece of comfort that ever was offered to an inquiring mind. Not even shadowy indeed, for a shadow implies substance, and in this case there is no substance. It is very much as if I should approach a man who is bewailing his poverty, and should say to him : "My good sir, you have no reason whatever to be distressed. You are rich if you only knew it. Your great-grandfather was worth a million." It would not surprise me to hear the man reply in language more vigorous than polite. When the will of a deceased citizen is read, it is no uncommon thing for a son or daughter to say : "I ought to have

had this or that. I know father *meant* I should have it. He *must* have intended to give it to me in his will." The legal adviser has only one reply to make : "It may have been so. I do not question it; but until you can find another will, duly attested, which makes that bequest, I cannot assign that piece of property to you. This is the only testament which I know, and I must administer according to that."

That exactly represents the case as respects the original autograph theory. God may have given inerrant autographs. I do not deny it; but neither have I any warrant for affirming it. Those autographs have not appeared. Until they do, I have only my Bible as it is to live by, to be saved by, to preach from. I do not know that I am warranted in assuming the possibility of a better Bible than the one I have. I feel that I am hardly warranted in assuming so positively that God *must* have made a Bible of a different kind from the one He has actually given me. The evidence of the Divine authority and power of that Bible which is in my hand is so convincing, that I should think it bordering on self-conceit if I should declare that that Book fell short of God's original ideal. I am inclined to think that what I have is about what He meant to give me. I have quite enough in my Bible, with all its departures from the standard of verbal inerrancy, to keep me busy, and happy, and near to God in Christ for the rest of my life, without speculating upon the perfections of a possible and assumed Bible. It will be time enough to consider the original inerrant autograph Bible when it shall appear.

I have heard it said recently that, by falling back on the original inerrant autographs, we have a *good theory* to start with and to work toward. The phrase, "a good theory," is a begging of the whole question. A theory can be vindicated as good only by facts; and this theory cannot appeal to a fact, nor to the record of a fact, nor to the ghost of a fact. The original inerrant autographs *simply do not exist*, so far as we know. *They never did exist*, so far as we know. There is no record, no hint that any living soul ever saw them or heard of them. They are simply a conceived possibility in the minds of those who assume, on abstract grounds, that they must have existed.

Surely it will not answer for us to attempt the vindication of the verbal inerrancy of Scripture to thoughtful men on the basis of a nonentity, nor to hang the inspiration of Scripture on this very brittle peg of verbal

inerrant
existence
for mys
ever exi
their ne
cover al
What I
autogra
of cont
such th
sion are
reasonin
tion of
cated, i
Scriptu
nomen
tions o
our con
not be
to fit it
take c
Scriptu
facts o
nor in
broaden
Church
for wh
that of
board
of the
scholar
The
been,
tice, t
guide
the w
manus
dent t
tion of
nied r
clearly
human
of min
no str
define
tion;
itself,
sists o
edge.
the fa
all thi
ing i
Christ
to on
hidd
over
prim
set fo
to the
Jesus
the E

inerrancy. I do not deny the possible existence of inerrant autographs, though, for myself, I do not believe that any such ever existed. I am not anxious to prove their non-existence, nor am I zealous to discover and to point out errors in Scripture. What I contend for is, that *the inerrant autographs simply do not come into the field of controversy at all, because there are no such things.* The issues of such a discussion are far too important to warrant us in reasoning from nonentities. If the inspiration of Scripture is to be successfully vindicated, it must be from the phenomena of Scripture as we have it; and if the phenomena do not agree with our preconceptions of inspiration, then we must modify our conception to suit the phenomena, and not be guilty of wresting Scripture in order to fit it into our conception. Scripture can take care of itself. The inspiration of Scripture can face and can stand all the facts of Scripture. It will not be destroyed nor impaired, but rather dignified and broadened and enriched for the mind of the Church by being recognized and accepted for what it really is. It matters very little that our ideals of inspiration go by the board (if that must needs be). The Word of the Lord no man can shake, no human scholarship impair.

The Bible must continue to be, as it has been, our infallible rule of faith and practice, the mainstay of Christian truth, the guide to salvation, the source of comfort for the weary and heavy-laden, the Church's manual of education. But the facts incident to the human element in the composition of the Bible, facts which cannot be denied nor evaded, and which go ever more clearly to show that it does not answer to human ideals of literary completeness and of minute consistency; the fact that it lays no stress on these; that it does not even define for us the ideal of its own inspiration; that it even nowhere calls itself *by itself*, the Word of God; the fact that it insists on experience rather than on knowledge, or on knowledge through experience; the fact that it emphasizes character above all things, and gathers up its whole teaching into the perfect manhood of Jesus Christ—all this seems to me to be pointing to one truth, which has been blurred and hidden by the smoke of the fierce conflict over *the Book*—the truth that *God's great primary purpose in revelation was not to set forth a book, but to set forth a God-man, to the end that men might believe on the Lord Jesus, might be conformed to the image of the Eternal Son, and might thus be saved.*

Certainly the Book is a means to this. Certainly the more Christ shall be exalted in human thought and faith, the more His true followers will cherish the Book. But as certainly, *Christ is more than the Book*; to be in Christ and like Christ is more than to have a correct theory of inspiration; and the great consummation of God's movement in human history, while it will gloriously vindicate the truthfulness of the Book, will be, not *the Book* on the throne, but *the Lamb* in the midst of the throne, with every knee bent and every tongue confessing that Christ is Lord.

THE PRESENT POSITION OF THE JOHANNEAN CONTROVERSY.

BY PROFESSOR W. SANDAY, D.D.

From *The Expositor* (London), January, 1892.

III. RELATION TO THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

As I am just entering upon an examination of the internal evidence supplied by the Fourth Gospel, it may be well for me to preface the remarks I am about to make by explaining my silence upon a point which some may think an essential one. Neither in this paper nor in those which follow do I propose to say anything about the possibility of the supernatural, or the *a priori* credibility of narratives which imply the supernatural. I do this, not because I take it absolutely for granted, but because I think that if we are to set about a systematic and scientific examination of the grounds of the Christian faith, this question of the supernatural is in logical order the last with which we ought to deal, and because, so far as the subject matter of these papers is concerned, we are not yet in a position to deal with it satisfactorily. No doubt there are persons who cannot afford to wait for the solution of so momentous a question. To such I would strongly recommend the second of Mr. Gore's *Bampton Lectures*, or an excellent work entitled *Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief*, by Dr. G. P. Fisher, of Yale. But to those who are content to take what I cannot but think the more excellent way of prolonging their inquiry, and breaking it up into its several steps and stages, I would submit that the proper order is this: First, to determine what documents we can use, and how far we can use them: then, by the help of these documents, to determine as nearly as we can what are the historical facts; and, lastly,

and not until that has been done, to consider the cause of those facts, and how far it transcends, or does not transcend, our common experience.

Our present inquiry belongs to the first of these stages. We are trying to ascertain who was the author of one of our documents; and this can quite well be done, as I think it ought to be done, without raising the question of the supernatural. If the Gospel ascribed to St. John is not genuine *with* the supernatural, it will be not genuine *without* it. If it is not genuine, there must surely be other indications that it is not genuine besides the mere presence of miracles. There are certainly a multitude of other *data* which point one way or the other. And my contention is, that when we have thoroughly examined all those other *data*, it will be time, and the proper time, to raise the question of the supernatural. We put it on one side for the present, not because we are not prepared to meet it, or because we cannot, even as it is, give a rough and ready answer to it, but because at that future date of which I speak we shall be able to approach it with far greater firmness, sureness, and precision.

Measured by the standard of the Synoptics, objection has been taken to the Fourth Gospel on five—or throwing in a subordinate point which it may be convenient to treat here, we may say six—main grounds: (1) That the scene of our Lord's ministry is laid for the most part in Judæa rather than in Galilee; (2) that its duration is extended over some two and a half years instead of one; (3) that in particular a different day, Nisan 14th instead of 15th, is assigned to the crucifixion; (4) that there is a further discrepancy of no great moment in connexion with this which involves however the question of the evangelist's reckoning of the hours of the day; (5) that the historical narrative is wanting in development and progression, especially on the important point of our Lord's declaration of His Messiahship; (6) that this goes along with a general heightening of His claims.

Of these six points the first three may be said to be practically given up. The fourth is really indifferent, though I should be glad to say a few words upon it. It is on the last two that the criticism which is adverse to St. John's authorship concentrates itself most tenaciously, and on these therefore that it will be well for us to give our best attention.

1 & 2. With reference to the scene of our Lord's ministry, and the repeated journeys

from Galilee to Judæa, Schürer's judgment is as follows:

"It is well known that the Synoptics only speak of a ministry of Jesus in Galilee, and do not make Him go to Judæa until the last period before His death. The Fourth Gospel, on the other hand, makes Him come forward at the very beginning in Judæa, and then and several times travel backwards and forwards between Judæa and Galilee, and that in such a way as to give the preponderance to Judæa. Now Baur tried to explain all the particulars of this coming and going in St. John as dependent on the design which the evangelist had in view. It cannot be said that this explanation has proved satisfactory. On the other hand, Bleek pointed out that a repeated sojourn of Jesus in Judæa was in itself quite probable, and indeed that many indications in the Synoptics themselves were in its favour. In the more recent treatises there has not been so much stress laid upon this point as Baur and Bleek assigned to it. Rightly so, because it cannot be decisive. The Synoptic version is in this respect so vague, that in no case can it count as an adverse argument. But if the Johannine version is to be preferred, that proves no more than that the author had access to independent traditions."*

True, there are both possibilities, that the author drew from his own memory, and that he drew from a good tradition. But in any case this point at least must be set down to his credit; it is an argument not against but for the historical character of the Gospel, as far as it goes.

That St. John is right about this Judæan ministry is surely overwhelmingly probable. The silence of the Synoptics, and the detailed allusions to such a ministry, have been excellently treated by Dr. Westcott† and other English commentators; but I doubt if they have quite laid sufficient stress on the broad probabilities of the case. That the Messiah should offer Himself to His people, and only spend the last week of His life at the centre of the national life and the national religion, is too great a paradox. If He was aware, as His own lips tell us, that it could not be "that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem,"‡ can we believe that He would have been satisfied only to perish there? Was it not further true, as St. John hints, that Jerusalem was the proper home of the prophets? Had not the Jew—the genuine Jew, and not merely the Galilean—that prerogative right on which St. Paul so often insists (*Ἰουδαίου πρῶτον*) to the offer of the gospel? Was it not included in that deep, underlying necessity which marked out the lines of the Lord's manifestation, that He should really go to the heart of Israel and make Himself known there? A number of details in the events

* *Vortrag*, p. 61 f. † Page lxxvii, ff. ‡ Luke xiii. 33.

of the
to m
the
by t
uppe
in th
Jose
so n
detai
Gosp
migh
of th
Gosp
B
they
whic
pluc
Gali
was
the
cost
state
Pass
that
τὸ π
stro
favo
tha
do
con
shou
with
read
alon
sion
whic
Dr.
the
T
of t
Syn
mon
can
that
of i
no c
3.
per
thin
not
thes
appe
Sup
ther
(the
the
foll
John
back

of the last week—the crowds that come out to meet Him at the entry into Jerusalem; the prompt recognition of His commands by the owners of the ass's colt and of the upper room; His own words, "I sat daily in the temple;" the solicitude of men like Joseph of Arimathea—imply that He had so made Himself known there. But these details do not stand alone; if the Fourth Gospel had not come down to us at all, we might have been sure that on this question of the scene of the ministry the Synoptic Gospels were incomplete.

By one little detail they seem to show that they are equally incomplete as to the time which it occupied. When the disciples pluck the ears of corn, quite early in the Galilean ministry, that means that the corn was ripe, but not reaped. In other words, the time was between Passover and Pentecost.* This fits in well with St. John's statement (vi. 4), that one intermediate Passover was spent in Galilee. I am aware that Dr. Hort strains every nerve to eject τὸ πάσχα from this verse. This is quite the strongest piece of argument I know in favour of the one year's ministry. But at the end of his long and important note, I do not gather that even Dr. Hort would contend for more than that the omission should be noted in the margin; and that with full consciousness of the weaknesses of readings which rest on patristic evidence alone, without support from MSS. and versions. We may add, on patristic evidence which is entirely indirect and inferential. Dr. Westcott in his commentary argues for the retention of the words.

The case stands thus: If we could get rid of the words τὸ πάσχα, the Johannine and Synoptic chronologies could be easily harmonized. But even with the words they can still be harmonized; the simple fact being that the Synoptic Gospels are only a series of incidents loosely strung together, with no chronology at all worthy of the name.

3. In regard to the day of the Last Supper and of the crucifixion, they have something better than a chronology. They do not say expressly on what day of the month these two events took place; but they let it appear by incidental allusions that the Last Supper was the Paschal meal, and that it therefore fell on the evening of Nisan 14-15 (the Jewish day beginning at dusk), and the crucifixion in the afternoon of the day following, still called Nisan 15. In St. John both events are to all appearance put back one day: the Last Supper falls on

Nisan 13-14, and the crucifixion in the afternoon, as Nisan 14 is ending.

What are we to say to this? Schürer once more sums up with judicial fairness.

"The arguments (he says) in favour as well of the one interpretation as of the other are so weighty, that a cautious person will hardly venture with full confidence to pronounce either the one or the other to be right."†

The advocate of the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel may well be content with this verdict. The case is certainly one of those which are more common than we might consider antecedently probable, where of two conclusions one only can be right, and yet a really substantial case may be made out for each. The question is, which can be interpreted into agreement with the other with the least forcing? When I wrote on this Gospel twenty years ago, I argued strongly in favour of the *prima facie* sense of St. John. I have not even now formed an opinion which I should regard as absolutely final; but if I were to express the opinion to which I incline at this moment, it would be rather the other way. The considerations on which this different estimate turns are these. (1) I am inclined to rate more highly the indirect evidence that the Supper described in the Synoptics is really the Paschal meal. (2) I satisfied myself with too little inquiry that St. John's phrase, "to eat the Passover" (φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα), must refer to the eating of the Paschal lamb. With our associations it is natural to think this, and I have before me a monograph of Schürer's in which this view is held. But Dr. Schürer's opinion is challenged by a higher authority on such a point even than his—Dr. Edersheim.‡ It appears to be certain that the term "Passover" was applied, not merely to the Paschal lamb, but to all the sacrifices of the Paschal feast, especially to the *Chagigah*, or peace offering brought on Nisan 15. It appears also to be proved that the Pharisees by entering a heathen house would be debarred from eating there, but not debarred from eating the Passover in the narrowest sense, because their defilement would only last till evening, *after* which the Supper commenced. Dr. Edersheim puts it thus:

"No competent Jewish archaeologist would care to deny that *Pesach* may refer to the *Chagigah*; while the motive assigned to the Sanhedrists by St. John implies that in this instance it *must* refer to this, and not to the Paschal Lamb."‡

Many other writers, notably Wieseler and McClellan, have argued ably to the same

* P. Ewald, *Hauptproblem*, etc., p. 32; McClellan, *Gospels*, p. 558.

† *Vortrag*, p. 63.

‡ *Life and Times*, etc., vol. II., p. 566 ff., ed. 4.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 568.

effect.* (3) I was also too hasty in assuming that the day when the Paschal lamb was sacrificed would be marked by a more complete cessation from work and trade than the other days. As a fact, it was not so strictly kept as the Sabbath. Work was stopped, but not traffic. There would be no obstacle either to Judas buying *Chagigah*, or to Joseph of Arimathea and the women procuring linen and spices.† It seems probable that Simon of Cyrene, like so many other pilgrims, lodged outside the city, and was coming in to the temple worship, not from work.

The other difficulties are not serious. *Παρασκευή* alone had come to be the regular Jewish word for "Friday," and *παρασκευή τοῦ πάσχα* ‡ may be quite as well "Friday in Paschal week" as the "day of preparation for the Passover." Or rather, the latter interpretation must be considered extremely doubtful, if, as it is asserted by McClellan and Wieseler, there is no example of the phrase bearing that sense. We should also expect the article in the latter case, not in the former. Another point on which I laid some stress, *πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα* (John xiii. 1), I do not think will hold. It is a rather remarkable peculiarity of the Fourth Gospel that it brings into close juxtaposition events, or events and sayings, which so near together seem almost to contradict each other. For instance, at the marriage-feast at Cana, our Lord is made to say, "My hour" (*i.e.* for working miracles) "is not yet come," though a few minutes later He acts as if His "hour" had come; in vii. 8 (according to the reading which is perhaps, on the whole, more probable), He is made to say that He will not go up to the Feast of Tabernacles, yet He does go up in time to arrive at the middle of the feast. So here I think it quite possible that "before the Feast of the Passover" may mean an hour or so before, and not a whole day before.

On these grounds I now incline to harmonize St. John with the Synoptics; but I feel that the casting vote upon the question must be reserved for specialists in Jewish antiquities. In any case, there is nothing to prevent the account in the Fourth Gospel from being written by an Apostle.

4. Another smaller question of the same kind, which it may be well to touch upon here, relates to the reckoning of *hours of*

the day in the Gospel. This too is to a small extent a question of harmonizing, but nothing of any importance turns upon it. According to St. Mark the succession of events is this:

| | | |
|---|-----|--------------|
| Delivery to Pilate | ... | about 6 a.m. |
| (<i>πρωτ</i> , Mark xv. 1.) | | |
| Crucifixion | ... | 9 a.m. |
| (<i>ὥρα τρίτη</i> , Mark xv. 25.) | | |
| Darkness | ... | 12-3 p.m. |
| (<i>γενομένης ὥρας ἑκτῆς</i> ... <i>ἕως ὥρας ἐννάτης</i> , Mark xv. 33.) | | |

In St. John the note of time is inserted in the account of the hearing before Pilate: "Now it was the Preparation of the Passover (rather perhaps 'Friday in the Paschal week'): it was about the sixth hour" (John xix. 14). Clearly this does not agree if by the sixth hour is meant, as it usually would, "noon." But all would fall beautifully into place if by "sixth hour" could be meant "6 a.m.," as with us. Such harmonizing as this is perfectly legitimate where it can be done without putting a strain upon the evidence. Even if the Gospel were written in the middle of the second century, there would be no reason to assume gratuitous contradictions. And it happened that in this particular instance there were a number of similar notes of time,* all of which seemed to be a degree more satisfactorily explained in connexion with their context if the reckoning were from midnight and midday as with us. Could St. John have adopted such a reckoning? It is well known that it has often been contended, especially in England, but also by writers like Tholuck, Meyer (not, however, Weiss in the sixth and following editions of Meyer), Ewald, and Wieseler, that he could. Writing with Wieseler's elaborate discussion before me, I nevertheless hesitated to claim more than a possibility for this view. Since then it has been maintained with his usual ability and accuracy by McClellan, and adopted also by Bishop Westcott. The subject has been recently reviewed, rather in a negative sense, by the Rev. J. A. Cross.† This has led me to go over the evidence again as well as I could with the help of two extremely full monographs by Dr. Gustav Bilfinger, *Der bürgerliche Tag* and *Die antiken Stundenangaben*, both published at Stuttgart in 1888. In consequence of this I should be obliged myself to take the negative view. The natural and common

* Wieseler, *Beiträge*, p. 242 ff.; McClellan, *Gospels*, p. 486 ff.
 † See the Talmudic references in Nösgen, *Geogr. d. Neutest. Offenb.*, vol. i., p. 679; Dillmann-Knobel on Exod. xii. 16; Ebersheim, *Life and Times*, p. 508 n., and App. xvii., p. 788.
 ‡ See ref. to Josephus in McClellan on Matt. xxvii. 62, and the note on John xix. 14; also p. 485.

* i. 39: iv. 6, 7, 52, 53. Cf. McClellan, *Gospels*, p. 742, etc.; Westcott, *St. John*, p. 232.
 † *Class. Rev.*, June, 1891, p. 245 ff.

reckoning among the Romans, as well as other peoples, was the working day from sunrise to sunset. For certain legal purposes, however, the day was held to begin at midnight. This had a religious or ceremonial ground in the practice of augury. The auspices must be taken at night, and they must also be taken on the same day with the action to which they referred. Hence it was clearly necessary to annex a portion of the preceding night to the day. This portion began with midnight. From the sphere of religious ceremony this passed into the sphere of law; anything which happened before midnight was held to fall in the day past, anything after midnight in the day begun. This determined in particular the day of birth. The day so reckoned was called the "civil day."*

There is however no evidence that this reckoning of the *days* carried with it a corresponding reckoning of the *hours*. And further I agree with Mr. Cross in his general conclusion, if not in quite all of his arguments, that the proof that this mode of reckoning hours prevailed in Asia Minor breaks down. The passage of Pliny on which greatest stress is laid (*Epp.* iii. 5) refers to 1 and 2 a.m. and midnight. Roman habits were very much earlier than ours. And the evidence that the Asiatic martyrdoms took place in the forenoon is much too remote to be conclusive. Bilfinger touches upon the hypothesis, only to reject it peremptorily.†

It will be remembered that Eusebius has a wholly different solution of the difficulty. He explains "the sixth hour" in St. John as a textual corruption, Γ (=3) being misread as digamma F (=6). And the reading is actually found in a rather strong group of authorities with a Western cast, just as the converse change has some slight support in St. Mark. We must leave the discrepancy as we find it.

5. With the next point we pass on to more serious ground. It will be well to take Schürer's statement, because if this held good it would constitute a really formidable indictment. I hope, however, to show (1) that it is not an accurate representation of the facts; (2) that so far as it does represent them, the implied inference does not follow.

The charge is that between the Fourth Gospel and the earliest Synoptic document there is a *deep-seated difference respecting the whole course of the ministry of Christ.*

* Aulus Gellius, *Noct. Att.* iii. 2 (= Macrobius, *Saturn.* i. 3. 2-10); Censorinus, *De Die Nat.*, c. 23. Cf. Bilfinger, *Der bürgerl. Tag*, pp. 12, 198-206.

† *Die antiken Stundenangaben*, p. 112.

"According to the version in our St. Mark (says Schürer), it is in the highest degree probable that Jesus did not from the first come forward as the Messiah. (a) He is indeed absolutely certain of His mission. He challenges faith in the fact that through Him God offers His grace and His help to man. But with the claim to be the Messiah, the Son of God, with this title, in true pedagogic wisdom He only presents Himself at a later period and gradually. (b) To this attitude on His part there corresponds also the attitude of His disciples. They join themselves to Him as their Teacher without any question being raised as to His Messiahship. Even at the stilling of the storm at sea the disciples say with surprise (Mark iv. 41), 'Who is this, that the wind and the sea obey Him?'—an expression of astonishment which would be impossible if they had already recognized Him as the Messiah. Not until Caesarea Philippi does Peter for the first time break out into the confession, 'Thou art the Messiah' (Mark viii. 29). The solemnity with which this is related shows plainly that we have to do with the first breaking forth of this conviction in the consciousness of the disciples. Yet even then Jesus still forbids His disciples to speak of it in public. He wishes not to rouse the unspiritual enthusiasm of the multitude. Only just at the end of His ministry does He allow the multitudes to pay homage to Him as the Messiah. (c) With the whole of this presentation agrees the portraiture of John the Baptist in the oldest Synoptic tradition. The oldest report, as it is preserved in Mark and Luke, knows nothing about John recognising Jesus as the Messiah at the baptism. On the contrary, it is well known how the Synoptics relate that John, even when he was in prison, has the question put to Jesus whether He is the Messiah (Matt. xi. 2-6 = Luke vii. 18-23). In the context of the Synoptic narrative this is not the question of one who has, after the fact, become doubtful, but the question of one in whom this belief flames up for the first time. All this gives a thoroughly consistent picture.

"Just as consistent, but in all respects opposed to it, is that which is drawn for us in the Fourth Gospel. Here from the first Jesus comes forward with the full claim to Divine sonship and Messiahship. (a) One of His first acts is that, in virtue of His supreme (*höherem*) authority, He cleanses the temple from all secular traffic,—an event which the Synoptists put at the very end of the public ministry. Such a step assumes the full claim to supreme, nay Divine dignity. (b) And so, according to the Fourth Gospel, Jesus is from the first acknowledged by His disciples too as the Messiah. 'We have found the Messiah,' says Andrew to his brother Simon (i. 41). 'We have found Him of whom Moses and the prophets wrote,' exclaims Philip to Nathanael. The disciples therefore attach themselves to Jesus, not only as pupils to a teacher, but because they have recognised in Him the Messiah. (c) And as the disciples, so also is John the Baptist from the first fixed in his belief in Jesus as the Messiah; indeed, his is the first clearly uttered testimony to the Divine mission of Jesus, and it is through him that, at His very first appearance, Jesus receives His credentials before the world.

"It is clear that these two portraits mutually exclude each other. If the first is historical, the second cannot be; but, then the hand that drew it cannot be that of an Apostle, cannot be that of an actual disciple of the Lord."*

* *Vortrag*, pp. 63-65.

Certainly an impressive argument, if the facts were as they are stated. But before testing them, let us pause for a moment over the inference at the end. Surely if there is one thing which characterizes the action of memory, especially of memory looking back over a wide interval, it is the tendency to *foreshorten*. Events lose their perspective. Features in the picture are inserted out of place. The mind is so full of the significance of what followed, that the traces of that significance are antedated, they are thrown backward to a time when they had not yet discovered themselves. This is a matter of extremely common experience. I could therefore allow that there was some antedating in the narrative of the Fourth Gospel, without denying it to be the work of an Apostle. It would be the easier to do this because the author, whoever he was, had just the kind of mind which is most liable to such displacements. He has not the simplicity or *naïveté* of the second evangelist; but ideas take the strongest hold upon him, and he sees facts in the light of them. That in such a mind, setting itself to write history, there should be an element of anticipation would not be at all surprising.

But is it the case that the Synoptic versions and the Johannine version are so diametrically opposed as they are made out to be? I cannot admit that they are.

We are pursued by the influence of names and the associations which we attach to them. Because Andrew or Philip say, "We have found the Messiah," and because we have learnt to read into that title the whole depth of Pauline and Johannine theology, we at once imagine that they also must have done the same thing. We forget that there were twenty Messiahs in the period between the death of Herod and the Jewish War, most of whom were extinguished before they had time to become formidable. The impulse which led the few friends and neighbours to follow the mysterious intimations of John, and attach themselves to the Person of Jesus, was a most tentative thing. If they did call Him "the Messiah," they knew not what they said. Even John, we may well believe, did not know all that he said. He spoke under the prophetic *affatus*, which lifted him above his natural level; and when this subsided, his views of things would become more ordinary again. The Triple Synopsis makes him predict the coming of One mightier than himself, who would baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire. The Triple Synopsis also leaves no doubt of the

signs which accompanied the baptism of Jesus, and asserts that the Holy Spirit itself visibly rested upon Him. The Fourth Gospel adds a different feature, "the Lamb of God," but nothing which essentially goes beyond what we have already had in the Synoptics.

It is, I cannot but think, an unimaginative criticism which finds it necessary to explain away the access of doubt which came over John in prison. The wonder is that any one who shared the expectations which all Israel entertained of their Messiah could keep up his faith in One who so deliberately and persistently contradicted them. Jesus by His reply gave him a sign. He recalled to his mind a forgotten prophecy, which hit the central truth of what the Messiah was to be. By meditating on that, John might be led to recast his own idea and rise to a higher one.

The temptation to round off a telling antithesis has sadly spoiled Dr. Schürer's presentment of the facts. Why is there such lofty assumption involved in the cleansing of the Temple? Is it not an act that any prophet might have done? Again, is it true that St. John takes no note of the reserve of Christ in proclaiming His Messiahship? "According to the Synoptics," says Schürer, "He does not wish to rouse the unspiritual enthusiasm of the multitude." What of that incident where Jesus retires into solitude to escape the crowd which would come "to take Him by force and make Him king"? * What, again, of that taunt and the reason alleged for it: "If Thou doest these things, show Thyself to the world: for neither did His brethren believe on Him"? The family of Jesus is incredulous in the Synoptics; it is incredulous also in St. John. The seventh chapter takes us straight into the middle of the public ministry; it gives us a picture of the current feeling and notions about Christ: is that a picture of implicit faith, of commanding and unquestioned Godhead? And quite late in the day we are told how the Jews crowded round our Lord with the demand, "How long dost Thou hold us in suspense (τῇν ψυχὴν ἡμῶν αἰεὶς)? If Thou art the Christ, tell us plainly."†

There are as many and as unequivocal signs of the reserve of Christ in St. John as in the Synoptics, if we will but look for them.

6. Lastly, we have another point, which is no doubt also of serious moment. The Fourth Gospel gives us another *Christus-*

* St. John vi. 15.

† St. John x. 24.

bild, a
ity. "A
ther, t
says a
self, a
depend
these,
clusiv
and th
Synop
Ag
too th
that
guide
mind
had b
of Jes
over
elapse
really
he ha
fully
which
some
and n
So
In
great
duce
where
recon
their
power
over
goes
high
with
thou
them
lent
subj
that
the
the
It is
stan
the
guar
istic
δὲ
forc
τείν
were
year
of v
que
othe
den
T

bild, a portrait of Christ which is all divinity. "That Jesus came forth from the Father, that He is one with Him, that all He says and does is a revelation of God Himself, and that therefore the salvation of men depends upon His acceptance or rejection—these," says Schürer,* "are the almost exclusive themes of the Johannean discourses, and they have only one clear parallel in the Synoptics (Matt. xi. 2)."

Again let us begin by allowing that here too there may be a certain selection, and that that selection may be influenced and guided by the meditation of a profound mind upon those "greater things" which had been wrought in the Spirit and Name of Jesus after His departure. Looking back over the fifty or sixty years which had elapsed, the Apostle saw what were the really fundamental truths in the life which he had been permitted to witness. He carefully gathers up and reproduces all the hints which had been given of these truths,—sometimes, it may be, making them fuller and more explicit.

So far we may go, but no further.

In the first place, let us note that the great passage, Matthew xi. 25-27, is reproduced almost exactly in Luke x. 21, 22, where it follows immediately upon the record of the return of the seventy and of their success in the exercise of miraculous powers. This Jesus accepts as proof of the overthrow of the Satanic kingdom; and He goes on solemnly to confer upon them higher powers still from the fulness of those with which He is Himself invested,—though not without a reminder that for them personally there is a yet more excellent way ("Rejoice not that the devils are subject to you," etc.). We may take it that the whole of this passage—in any case the crucial verse—comes from the *Logia*, the oldest of all evangelical compositions. It is introduced easily and naturally, and stands out by no apparent peculiarity from the surrounding context; and yet the language is full of what we consider characteristically Johannean expressions (*ὁ πατήρ*—*ὁ υἱός*; *παράδιδόναι*, of the entrusting of forces or powers; *ἐπιγινώσκειν*; *ἀποκαλύπτειν*). It is clear that such expressions were current as "words of the Lord," many years before St. John conceived the thought of writing a gospel. The degree of frequency with which they were repeated in other narratives would be a matter of accident or of the idiosyncrasy of the writer.

The Synoptics, it is true, give a more

photographic account of the life of Christ as He went in and out among the peasants of Galilee; but when we come to look at them a little more closely, we see that they have really the same substratum, the same underlying ideas, as the Fourth Gospel. They are not one whit less *Christo-centric*. The Son of man there too forgives sins, there too legislates for His Church, there too claims the devotion of His disciples, whose acts acquire value from being done "for His sake," "in His name." There too the Son is also Lord; there too He promises to dwell like the *Shekinah* among His people, and to give them help and inspiration after He is gone; there too He seals a new covenant with His blood; there too He declares that He will come again to judge.

What then is wanting? The criticism of the Fourth Gospel rings the changes upon one idea—the idea of pre-existence. This Schürer urges is in St. John always in the background, while in the Synoptic it is entirely wanting. There are two ways in which St. John teaches this doctrine of pre-existence, and in regard to each of these he employs a different cycle of language. The doctrine of the *Logos* in the prologue is one thing, the doctrine contained in the discourses of our Lord Himself is another. Still they approximate to each other. The idea of "sending" which occurs so often (with both verbs *πέμπω* and *ἀποστέλλω*) would not of itself imply pre-existence, because the prophets also were "sent;" but taken as it is in close connexion with the filial relation, "sending by the Father," and also in connexion with the communication of the things of the Father ("we speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen"), it does seem to contain a reference to the pre-existent state. The commonest form of phrase is "He that (the Bread that, etc.), came down out of heaven," "He that cometh from above." But we get very near to the doctrine of the *Logos* in such sayings as "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day: and he saw it, and was glad;" "before Abraham was, I am;" and, still more, in "the glory which I had with Thee before the world was;" and "Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world."*

All these are no doubt remarkable expressions. But let us consider for a moment. Have we heard nothing like them? When St. Peter speaks of the "Spirit of Christ" being in the prophets, and testifying through them to the sufferings of Christ;†

* Page 66.

* St. John viii. 56, 58; xvii. 5, 24.

† 1 Pet. i. 11.

when St. Paul speaks of the second Man as "the Lord from heaven," and of God as sending "forth His Son;" when he speaks of Him who, "though He was rich, yet for our sakes became poor," of Him who "existed in the form of God," of Him through whom "all things were created," who was "before all things," and in whom "all things consist;"* when the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of the Son through whom God "made the worlds," who "upholds all things by the word of His power"†—we are naturally driven back to some common source from which these three writers are drawing. Already in the year 57, if not earlier, St. Paul implies the existence of the doctrine. He refers to it as something which he takes for granted, and not as one propounding anything new.‡ Does not this bring us back very near the foundation-head of all Christian doctrine? Should we not be led to suspect, even if we had had no Fourth Gospel, that Christ Himself had laid the foundation on which His followers were building? But if that is so, the absence of this doctrine from the Synoptics and its presence in the Fourth Gospel only means that it has preserved what they had not preserved. And the argument on which so much stress has been laid turns out to be not against but for the ancient view, that we have in it the work of one who had lain on the breast of the Lord.

THE DANGER OF APOSTASY.

BY REV. P. J. GLOAG, D.D.

From *The Thinker* (London), March, 1892.

HEB. vi. 4-6.

Ἀδύνατον γὰρ τοῖς ἀπαξ φωτισθέντας γενομένοις τε τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου καὶ μετόχους γεννηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ καλῶν γενομένοις θεοῦ ῥήμα διδάμναι τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, καὶ παραπεσόντας πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν, ἀνασταυρῶντας ἑαυτοῖς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ παραδειγματίζοντας.

Authorized Version.—For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame.

Revised Version.—For as touching those who were once enlightened, and tasted of the heavenly

gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the age to come, and then fell away, it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame.

THERE is hardly any difference in the readings of these verses in the various manuscripts; so that the words may be assumed to be those written by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. One important correction of the Authorised Version is made by the Revisers in the omission of the conditional conjunction *if*—"if they shall fall away"—which has no existence in the original, and the insertion of which imparts an erroneous meaning to the passage. Some suppose it was designedly inserted by the translators of the Authorised Version for the purpose of lessening the difficulty of the passage and of favouring the Calvinistic doctrines of the indefectibility of grace and the perseverance of the saints, as if the case mentioned were a mere hypothesis; but it is now admitted that this charge of dishonesty on the part of the translators is an unwarrantable assumption. But the Revised Version itself is somewhat defective. There is no reason for removing the words "it is impossible" from the beginning of the sentence, or of translating the aorist sometimes in the perfect and sometimes in the past tense. Upon the whole we prefer the translation given by Dean Alford in his revised New Testament: "For it is impossible in the case of those who have been once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and have been made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, and have fallen away,—to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves afresh the Son of God, and put Him to an open shame."

The interpretation of the passage is extremely difficult: it certainly constitutes one of those things in Scripture which are hard to be understood. The five particulars stated in the case of those who have fallen away are ambiguous, and have given rise to a variety of meanings. The passage also has been the occasion of numerous controversies in the Christian Church. In the age of the Fathers it was the cause of the disputes between those heretical sects who held severe rules of discipline and the Catholic Church. And in modern times it has been one of those crucial passages which have been urged by the Calvinists and Arminians in the maintenance of their respective doctrines; the one asserting and

* 1 Cor. xv. 47; Gal. iv. 4; 2 Cor. viii. 9; Phil. ii. 6; Col. i. 16, 17.

† Heb. i. 2, 3.

‡ For this reason I think the view that the doctrine owes its origin to St. Paul, and that the other writers are all dependent upon him, very questionable.

the other denying the indefectibility of grace and the perseverance of the saints ; the one affirming that the reference must be to those who were never regenerated, but had experienced only the so-called common influences of the Spirit, and the other that the writer here expressly teaches that the regenerate may fall from the faith. Accordingly we must proceed to the elucidation of the passage with the greatest caution, with an unbiassed and unprejudiced mind, and must be careful not to interpret it in accordance with our preconceived opinions.

The first thing to be done is to consider the exegesis of the passage. *Ἀδύνατον γὰρ : for it is impossible.* Some, in order to lessen the difficulty and soften the severity of the expression, think that *ἀδύνατον* is to be taken relatively as an expression merely of extreme difficulty. Thus in the Latin versions of the Codices D and E the words are *difficile est*. Just as in common parlance, when a man is extremely ill, we say that it is impossible that he can recover, meaning thereby, not an absolute impossibility, but a high degree of improbability. Others soften the declaration by referring the impossibility to man, to human effort, but not denying the possibility to God. What is impossible with man may be possible with God. And certainly with God all things not implying a contradiction or moral inconsistency are possible. The word *ἀδύνατον*, as used in the New Testament, implies absolute impossibility, and cannot be weakened or explained away. Thus : "With men this is impossible ;" "It is impossible for God to lie ;" "It is impossible for the blood of bulls and of goats to take away sin ;" "Without faith, it is impossible to please God." In all these passages the word implies not only extreme difficulty, but that the thing was wholly impracticable ; it could not be done. Whether it was impossible with God to recover those who had apostatised ; whether it implied a moral contradiction ; whether, whilst human efforts are insufficient and the resources of the ministry of reconciliation are exhausted, there may not be some divine method of restoration—is not precisely affirmed, and we would not limit either the mercies or the power of God.

τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας : who have been once enlightened. The adverb *ἅπαξ* is a favourite term with the author of this Epistle, occurring in it eight times. Here it does not mean formerly, at one time ; but once for all, already ; it belongs not only to *φωτισθέντας*, but to all the particulars which fol-

low. "Enlightened" or illuminated denotes called out of darkness into light. Here, of course, it denotes spiritual illumination : called out of the darkness of heathenism or of Judaism into the light of the Gospel. It is equivalent to "having received the knowledge of the truth" in this Epistle (Heb. x. 26). And in another place the author bids his readers to "call to remembrance the former days in which they were illuminated" (Heb. x. 32). So St. Paul speaks of those who were "delivered from the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son" (Col. i. 13) ; and he prays for his converts that "the eyes of their understanding might be enlightened" (Eph. i. 18). Formerly they were in darkness, but now they are light in the Lord. As Erasmus expresses it, "who have for once left the darkness of their former life, being illuminated by the light of the Gospel."

γευσάμενους τε τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου : and have tasted of the heavenly gift. The verb to *taste* here evidently means to experience, to be made personally a partaker of. Thus, "If so be ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious" (1 Peter ii. 3). "O taste and see that the Lord is good" (Ps. xxxiv. 8). Those spoken of have had a personal and conscious experience of the heavenly gift. Whilst there is little difficulty in the interpretation of the first particular "once enlightened," this second particular has given rise to many interpretations. We can only here give a bare list of them, without stating by whom they have been suggested, or the arguments by which they have been supported. Thus, some understand by "the heavenly gift" the Holy Ghost, as the gift of God ; others, regeneration in general, the gift of spiritual life ; others, the Lord's Supper, interpreting the former particular of baptism ; others, the possession of eternal life, which is elsewhere called the gift of God ; others, Christ, the unspeakable gift ; others, the righteousness of Christ imparted to us ; others, the forgiveness of sins, which is the free gift of God ; and others, peace of mind, the legacy of Christ to His Church. Others, giving force to the particle *τε* as connecting the second clause with the first, "the enlightenment imparted through the preaching of the Gospel" : who have been once enlightened, namely, by having tasted of the heavenly gift. It appears best to understand the clause generally as denoting the blessings of the Gospel—all those precious gifts which Christ has bestowed upon men—the abundant grace of Christianity. They were not

only enlightened as to the knowledge of these gifts, but they experienced them in their own souls; they were made partakers of them. His gift or gifts are called heavenly, inasmuch as Christ came from heaven to purchase and bestow them, and as in heaven only they receive their full realisation.

καὶ μετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου : *and have been made partakers of the Holy Ghost.* In the interpretation of these words there is also a difference of opinion. Some refer them to the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, as prophesying, the speaking with tongues, the working of miracles, the gifts of healing which were bestowed upon the early Christians but are now withdrawn from the Church. Thus Paul asked certain Ephesian converts whether they had received the Holy Ghost since they believed; and when they answered in the negative he laid his hands on them, and the Holy Ghost came upon them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied (Acts xix. 6). And so also Peter and John came down from Jerusalem to Samaria, and laid their hands on the Samaritan converts, and they received the Holy Ghost (Acts ix. 17). Others affirm that there is nothing in the text limiting this assertion; and that the reception of the Holy Ghost must include all His influences—both those which are miraculous and those which are ordinary. Those who have been made partakers of the Holy Ghost were those in whom the Holy Ghost dwelt, who had experienced His sanctifying influences. They were *made partakers* of the Holy Ghost, namely by God, for whatever may be the instrument of participation, whether the laying on of hands, or the sacrament of baptism, or the word of God, He only is the efficient Agent.

καὶ καλὸν γευσάμενους θεοῦ ῥῆμα : *and have tasted the good word of God.* There is here a change on the construction of the verb *γεύεσθαι*. In the former clause it governs the genitive—"and have tasted of the heavenly gift;" here it governs the accusative—"and have tasted the good word of God." The construction with the genitive belongs to classical Greek, that with the accusative to Hellenistic Greek. Some suppose that this makes no difference in the meaning of the verb, but that the author here varies the construction to prevent the ambiguity that might arise from two genitives following each other. Others give the distinction as follows: The verb "tasting" takes the genitive when the thing partaken of is only partially partaken; it takes the accusative when the object partaken is considered as a whole. The heavenly gift is

apprehended little by little unto the end; whereas the word of God is apprehended as a whole. By the good word of God is evidently meant the Gospel, those glad tidings of great joy, announcing salvation and the restoration of the fallen and degraded to the favour and image of God. "Thanks," says the Apostle, "be unto God for His unspeakable gift," namely, for salvation through Jesus Christ. But whilst the Gospel generally is here meant, the consolations of the Gospel are specially intended—the revelation of forgiveness to the guilty, of rest to the weary, of comfort to the distressed. There are come parts of the Gospel which are of a severe character, as the denouncement of the wrath of God upon the ungodly; but by the epithet "good" (*καλὸν*), the promises rather than the threatenings of the Gospel are intended. Others consider that *ῥῆμα* is here to be taken as a personified attribute of God, equivalent to *λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ*, but there appears no reason for this conjecture.

δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος : *and the powers of the world to come.* Some suppose that by "the world to come" is meant the heavenly world. Those who taste the powers of the world to come are kept under the influences of eternity; they walk by faith and not by sight; they feel the awful importance of preparation for death and the realities of a future life; they look not at the things that are seen, but at the things which are not seen. They have tasted the powers of the world to come, have experienced the foretaste of glory. Others, again, as the Revisers, interpret the phrase of the Gospel dispensation, of the age of the Messiah—"the powers of the age to come." The age to come was the name given by the Jews of the Messianic age. Thus in Isaiah ix. 6, where Christ is called "the everlasting Father," the Septuagint renders the words, "the Father of the coming age." It is doubtful if the words imply this, as the author is writing not before but after the coming of the Messiah. By the *powers* of the world to come is meant the miraculous powers attending the publication of the Gospel: "God bearing witness with them both by signs and wonders, and by manifold powers and the gifts of the Holy Ghost" (Heb. ii. 4). But here also, as in the former case, there is no reason to limit those powers to miraculous gifts; they may include also those spiritual powers, those gifts of the Holy Ghost, conferred on those who embrace the Gospel, in strengthening and confirming them in the faith, in assisting them in prayer, and in enabling them

to resist temptation. There are spiritual powers within and around us which assist us in our conflict with the world, the flesh, and the devil; we are surrounded on all sides by the supernatural.

καὶ παραπεσόντας: and have fallen away. *Παραπίπτω* is to swerve, to fall into sin, here to apostatise. The statement is not to be understood conditionally as in the Authorised Version, but is a continuation of the description of the case stated. Those alluded to had tasted the good word of God and the powers of the world to come, and had fallen away. Every sin is a falling away (*παραπίπτωμα*); but the case here alluded to is evidently not a partial, but an entire falling away—complete apostasy. No gross sin is here alluded to, or any partial defection. Many have thus fallen away who have been afterwards fully restored. As Calvin remarks: "The Apostle speaks not here of theft, or perjury, or murder, or drunkenness, or adultery; but he refers to a total defection or falling away from the Gospel, when a sinner offends God not in some one thing, but entirely renounces His grace." Nor is it an inadvertent fall that is here spoken of, as when a man is surprised into the commission of some heinous wickedness, but wilful and deliberate apostasy. The words are similar to those used by the author in the parallel passage: "If we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth" (Heb. x. 26). The man not only made a profession of religion, but he was spiritually illuminated; he had experienced a sense of the blessings of the Gospel and the influences of the Spirit; he had felt the consolations of the word of God, and his soul had been powerfully impressed with divine things; yet, notwithstanding all this experience, he had fallen from the faith. The Hebrews addressed in this Epistle were in peculiar danger of apostasy. They were strongly tempted to renounce Christianity, and to relapse into Judaism and open opposition to Christ; and therefore they required this special warning. So, also, in a similar manner St. Paul writes to the Galatians, who were in a similar danger of relapsing into Judaism: "Ye are severed from Christ, ye who would be justified by the law; ye are fallen away from grace" (Gal. v. 4).

πάλιν ἀνακινεῖν εἰς μετάνοιαν: to renew them again unto repentance. To those words *ἀδύνατον* has to be attached. It is impossible to renew again those above described to repentance. The words *πάλιν ἀνακινεῖν* are not to be considered as a pleonasm, as if the verb *renew* contained in

itself the idea of *again*. Those mentioned had already been renewed when they were enlightened and made partakers of the Holy Ghost; and what is denied with regard to them is a second renewal—to renew them again (*πάλιν*) after they had fallen away. It is also to be observed that it is not said that it is impossible to renew them by repentance (*διὰ μετάνοίας*); if they repented of their apostasy they would be restored. But what is affirmed is that it is impossible to renew them unto repentance (*εἰς μετάνοιαν*); their wilful apostasy made them morally incapable of repentance; they had fallen into a state of hardened impenitence: nothing can now be done to arouse them; they have closed the door of grace against themselves.

ἀνασταυροῦντας ἑαυτοὺς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ παροδעיγματίζοντας: having crucified to themselves afresh the Son of God, and put Him to an open shame. *Ἀνασταυρεῖν* is to re-crucify, hence to crucify again or afresh. The reason of the impossibility of their repentance is here assigned: they here committed the awful crime of crucifying anew the Lord Jesus Christ. The title, Son of God, is here given to emphasise the enormity of their sin. They have re-acted the part of the Jews in crucifying Christ; nay, as Ebrard remarks, they have surpassed the Jews in their wickedness. "The Jews crucified in their madness a pseudo-Messiah, or at the worse a prophet. But he who has known and experienced Jesus as his Saviour and Redeemer, and yet after all falls away from Christianity, actually declares Him whom he has known as the Son of God to be a pseudo-Messiah and contemns Him." As in the parallel passage in this Epistle, "they have trodden under foot the Son of God, and have counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith they were sanctified, an unholy thing" (Heb. x. 29). It is said that they have crucified Christ to themselves (*ἑαυτοῖς*); that is, to their own great peril and guilt; they are guilty of the crucifixion of Christ, as the same disposition which induced the Jews to crucify Him actuates them. It is added, and have put Him to an open shame. The allusion may be to the shameful death of the Cross. They dishonour Christ among men, and give occasion to the enemies of the cross to blaspheme. By having first professed Christ, and afterwards denied Him, they have exposed Him to the reproaches of an ungodly world.

Such is the exegesis of the passage. We now come to the consideration of the different views which have been taken of it, and

of the controversies which have arisen from it. Before entering upon this subject, we have to observe that we have not here to deal with the supposed case. Some get over the difficulties of the passage by asserting that the writer here only advances a supposition, states a hypothetical case which can never possibly happen; no one who has passed through all the experiences here mentioned—who has been spiritually illuminated, who has been made a partaker of the Holy Ghost, can actually fall from the faith. The author mentions an impossible case, in order to impress upon the Hebrews the awful danger of every approach to apostasy. But this certainly is a most inadequate explanation, and would render the admonition of the sacred writer useless. It is not a mere hypothesis which he gives, but an actual case which might and which did happen.

1. In the primitive Church this passage was one great argument by which the Montanists, Novatians, Donatists, and other sects who held severe notions of ecclesiastical discipline supported their views. According to them, the lapsed should not be restored to the Christian Church. They who from fear of martyrdom had fallen from the faith and denied Christ, or had been guilty of certain heinous sins as licentiousness and murder, and had thus crucified the Son of God afresh, were incapable of restoration to the Christian Church; by no repentance could they be restored. Thus Tertullian, when he became a Montanist, quotes this passage in confirmation of the opinion that apostates cannot be restored. He attributes the Epistle to the Hebrews to Barnabas, and, after quoting the words under consideration and similar declarations, he says: "He (Barnabas), who learnt this from the Apostles and taught it with the Apostles, never knew of any second repentance promised by the Apostles to the adulterer and the fornicator." It is, however, to be observed that they did not deny the divine forgiveness: God, they admitted, may forgive such sinners on their repentance, but it was impossible for the Church to do so; its gates were forever barred against such heinous offenders. The Fathers in general took an opposite view. According to them, if the lapsed repented, they were to be restored. The passage does not relate to penitent sinners, but to those who by their conduct rendered themselves incapable of repentance. And certainly this milder view of the subject is fully justified.

2. The Fathers, in general, understand

the passage not as a declaration of the impossibility of repentance for apostates, but as a prohibition against the repetition of baptism. Thus Justin Martyr employs the words φωτισμός and φωτίζειν to denote baptism: "This washing (baptism) is called illuminative (φωτισμός), because they who learn these things are illuminated (φωτίζόμενοι) in their understandings." Chrysostom justifies the name φωτισμός given to baptism by reference to the two places where it occurs in this Epistle. According to this view, the whole passage has a reference to baptism: those who were once enlightened are those who have experienced spiritual illumination as a preparation for baptism; those who have tasted of the heavenly gift are those who have been made partakers of the grace conferred by baptism; those who have been made partakers of the Holy Ghost are those who have experienced baptismal regeneration; and those who have felt the powers of the world to come are those who have experienced those spiritual powers which result from baptism. If those who have been baptised fall away, they may be re-admitted into the Christian Church on their repentance, but are not to be re-baptised: to do so would amount to crucifying the Son of God afresh, and putting Him to an open shame. Such a view is very ingenious, and was much employed by the Fathers in their contest with the Montanists and Novatians. It is now almost entirely relinquished as being too artificial and not borne out by the correct explanation of the particulars.

3. The Calvinists, in the interests of the doctrines of the indefectibility of grace and the perseverance of the saints, suppose that the persons here alluded to were never really regenerated, but had only experienced the convincing influences of the Spirit; they were mere professors, and had never attained to the condition of true believers. Thus Calvin observes: "The elect are beyond the danger of finally falling away; for the Father who gave them to be preserved in Christ the Son is greater than all, and Christ promises to watch over them all so that none may perish. But I cannot admit that all this is any reason why He should not grant the reprobate also some taste of grace, why he should not irradiate their minds with some sparks of light, why He should not give them some perception of His goodness, and in some sort engrave His word on their hearts." According to this view, having been once enlightened refers to an external knowledge of the Gospel; having tasted of

the h
privile
partak
convic
tasted
joy wi
have
tasted
refers
presse
whoses
sumin
grace,
grace
this p
ity wi
places
plaine
The v
well
death
later
if the
saints
the at
in pes
state

4.
hold
bility
may f
they
tive t
ing m
Chris
again
not a
spoke
can it
penta
vertec
passa
erate
sage,
clares
perso
Su
vinist
one h
sarily
erate
imply
cordi
come
biass
sever
rathe
admi
motiv
and c
our

the heavenly gift refers to the common privileges of the Gospel; having been made partakers of the Holy Ghost, refers to the convincing influences of the Spirit; having tasted the good word of God, refers to the joy with which some receive the word, but have no root in themselves; and having tasted the powers of the world to come, refers to those who have been deeply impressed with the truths of the Gospel, but whose impressions have worn away. Assuming the doctrine of the indefectibility of grace, that if a man is once in a state of grace he cannot fall from it, they hold that this passage must be explained in conformity with the testimony of Scripture in other places; that what is difficult must be explained with what is plain and evident. The well-known anecdote of Oliver Cromwell illustrates this view. When on his death-bed, and recalling with dismay the later events of his life, he asked his chaplain if the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints was a reality, and being answered in the affirmative, he replied, "I can now die in peace, for I am sure that I was once in a state of grace."

4. The Arminians, on the other hand, hold that this passage teaches the defectibility of grace, that a regenerate person may fall from the faith. The expressions they consider to be too strong and cumulative to be toned down so as to denote nothing more than a mere nominal profession of Christianity. The phrase, "to renew again," can have no meaning if there were not a previous renewal. And if the persons spoken of had never been regenerated, how can it be more difficult to bring them to repentance than others who are also unconverted? Accordingly, they affirm that the passage does plainly teach that the regenerate may fall from the faith. "Our passage," observes Ebrard, "unmistakably declares the possibility that a regenerate person may fall away."

Such are the respective views of the Calvinists and Arminians on the verse: the one holding that the passage does not necessarily teach the falling away of the regenerate; the other, that it does evidently imply this. Both interpret the verse according to their dogmatic views. We must come to the study of the subject with unbiassed minds. The doctrine of the perseverance of the saints is a doctrine of logic rather than of experience, and does not admit of much practical application. The motives of our conduct are so complicated, and our hearts are so deceitful, that it is our wisdom not to trust to any sense of

security. St. Paul says that he judged not himself, although he knew nothing against himself. So we, although we may indulge a good hope through grace, yet must work out our own salvation with fear and trembling, and fear lest, even after all our experience, we should be castaways. Many who apparently were converted have fallen from the faith.

But, it may be asked, wherein does this impossibility of repentance consist? Not because it is beyond the power of God; God is able to do all things that are not inconsistent with His moral perfections, and do not involve a natural impossibility. Not because it is beyond the efficacy of the atonement of Christ; for the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin, and He is able to save to the uttermost. Not because God will not receive such a sinner on his repentance; for no sinner who turns to Him with sincere repentance will ever be rejected. But the reason is because the man has lost the power to repent: it is impossible to renew him again unto repentance; and without repentance he cannot be saved. He has rejected the only method of salvation; he has turned a deaf ear to the invitations of the Gospel. Besides it is to be observed that it is not a single act that is here described, but a fixed and stated condition, a deliberate and wilful apostasy, and as long as a man continues in a state of apostasy, he is beyond the pale of salvation. In the solemn words of the author of this Epistle, in language tantamount to that of the passage under consideration, "If we sin wilfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking-for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries."

The sin here mentioned bears a striking resemblance to the sin against the Holy Ghost mentioned by our Saviour. Like it, it is unpardonable; like it, it manifests itself in obstinate impenitence, and in the final rejection of the Saviour; like it, it is the continued resistance to the influence of the Spirit—"doing despite to the Spirit of grace"—such a prolonged resistance as causes the Spirit to withdraw and give up the man to a reprobate mind. In various parts of Scripture mention is made of unpardonable sin, as in the passage under consideration and in that similar passage often adverted to in this same Epistle; in our Lord's declaration concerning the sin against the Holy Ghost; and in those words of St. John: "If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask,

and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death: I do not say that he shall pray for it" (1 John. v. 16). These are solemn considerations—dark, impenetrable mysteries. We can only stand with our heads uncovered and bow before the Judge of all the earth; hoping that such a sin as is here described is seldom committed, and that what is impossible with man is possible with God. The judgments of God are a great depth which our feeble reason cannot fathom, and which must be left to the disclosures of a future life. "If Thou Lord shouldst mark iniquity, who can stand? But there is forgiveness with Thee that Thou mayst be feared."

WOMAN'S PLACE IN CHURCH WORK.

BY MRS. JOSEPHINE BUTLER, MRS. SHELDON AMOS, AND MRS. BRAMWELL BOOTH.

From *The Review of the Churches* (London), February, 1892.

I.

MRS. JOSEPHINE BUTLER.

YOU have asked me for a few words on "Woman's Work in the Church." It is perhaps the most difficult subject which could be presented to me to write about. It would be easier for me to speak of the work of women outside the Churches, or, in spite of the Church; and not difficult, though the subject is large, to speak of "Woman's Work for Christ." It seems to me that "the Church" has treated woman very much as "the world"—as Society has treated her, from the earliest days till now. Yet I am not wholly a rebel in this matter. I see that her position would have been far worse but for the light which Christ shed upon it, a few broken rays of which light have been permitted to fall upon her state, athwart the complicated inventions of Churchmen and of men of the world with the name of Christians. In the early Christian days certainly, saintship was acknowledged as attainable by women equally with men; and up to the 12th or 13th century one cannot help observing that in one respect the Church was mindful of the truth that in Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female. I do not think we find in Protestant annals of Christian lives any such recognition of that principle so clear or so eloquent as is to be found in the "Acta

Sanctorum." The "lives of the Saints" (active as well as contemplative Saints) in that noble record include both sexes. It has been a true consolation to me to study those annals, in which the annalists appear gloriously oblivious in many cases as to the sex of the Saints of whom they are writing; who were equally God-appointed messengers to the world, sometimes as active administrators and divinely inspired politicians, as well as teachers, healers, or solitary students of Divine things. I think we Protestants are rather at a loss what to do with our Saints. We put up painted windows, or erect some charitable building in their honour, or write a biography—in the latter case, if the subject be a woman, with more or less of an apology or explanation, for her having a little stepped out of the "woman's sphere" (that prison house for so much that is good) and having encroached a little on the man's field of activity. We have no tribunal for judgment of the standard which merits canonization, no "devil's advocate" of the old style (a very useful person), and no effort on the part of our reformed Churches to gather into one great fragrant bouquet the memories of those among us who have lived nearest to God. Well, perhaps this is for the best, so apt are we to carry our admiration and worship to beings lower than God Himself, and to lapse into idolatry. But we have lost something nevertheless, and women have been the greatest sufferers by the loss.

The shabby, disrespectful way in which I have heard Protestant ministers speak of the Mother of Christ—as if she was the most ordinary of women, a mere instrument and no more—has made me wonder less at the small amount of recognition given in our Churches to the fact that woman is, equally with man, God's minister upon the earth in matters spiritual, though not necessarily chosen to work in precisely the same fashion; no, happily not.

The Church of the first centuries, however, seems, save in the case of exceptionally sainted or gifted women, not to have risen much, if at all, above the accepted theories of the mass of the men of the times, in its treatment of women in general. They were in subjection, often abjectly so. The Church has always allowed herself to be bound, held back, dragged down, more or less, by the overpowering weight of unregenerate male feeling and opinion in this matter, aided, since the Reformation, by the narrow Pauline directions, which (given for the correction of the conduct of silly and ignorant Greek women of the day),

men have elected to apply to all women in all times, and have allowed to override the teaching of Christ on this matter, a teaching which sets in the fullest light the principles which ought to have been dear to the Church, and to have been her guide in this vital matter.

"Woman's Work in the Church." The very words raise up the first great difficulty to me, an unlearned person. What is the Church? I have read the various definitions, and still do not see that people always clearly know what they mean when they speak of the Church. Is the word meant to express a single outward organisation, august, ancient, and venerable; or a number of outward organisations, more or less united by the common acceptance of a great central truth; or the narrow English view of "the Church," the Anglican State Church; or the great spiritual host of believers? In any of these cases I should not venture to write of woman's work "in the Church," for I have not sufficient knowledge. I see in your *Review of the Churches*, which I read with increasing interest, that you record duly work done by women in the different denominations. I read this record with thankfulness—but a limited thankfulness. It proves that Christian men have come on a step or two; that they are coming on, as fast perhaps as one can expect, in the matter of placing women more by their side in all Church work, and not solely under their direction and in subordinate positions. For too long a time women have been graciously permitted only to sweep out the church, to wash the ecclesiastical robes of the Catholic or Protestant popes and priests, to feed the poor under their supervision, and to read the Bible inside poor people's houses. And women themselves have been very slavish. It is humiliating to see a gifted woman, with dignity enough for a Bishop or a Prime Minister, putting herself willingly under the guidance of some inexperienced, *not* gifted clergyboy. The process is very injurious to the clergyboy.

I do not ask that the positions should be reversed. I only desire freedom; freedom for women as well as men, to expand, and to fulfil, in any and every direction, the spiritual destiny of which God has made them capable. Neither do I despise small and even menial services. All are ennobled, if done for love's sake to God and man. But here again there should be freedom and equality. The humblest offices should be undertaken alike by men and women; the highest offices open alike to men and women.

I said that I read the record of the present work of women in the various Churches with a limited thankfulness; limited, because to my ambitious soul *office* seems but a poor thing. To climb any ladder to office, even if it be the highest outward office in Church or State, is not my first ambition for my fellow women.

I am glad to see office attainable by them because it proves that the sense of justice is gaining ground in the minds of men; and I utter daily a hearty "God bless them" for the men whose eyes are so far opened.

But now I must try to come into the presence of Christ. Here, my words labour, and I speak with a sense of utter dependence on the teaching of His Spirit. I speak not as a theologian, nor as yet a deeply taught student of Scripture, but as a woman—a woman who has fought a hard battle, with but partial help, during the burden and heat of the day, from the Churches (and with direct opposition from many members of the Churches), and who was driven to turn quite round, away from all other authority or teaching, and to come, with her broken heart, to the feet of the Master—the only Wise, the only Holy, the only *Just One*. It was a question not so much of woman's work in the Church, as of the equality of men and women in moral matters, in which I believed God had called me to act. I turned to the eighth chapter of St. John's Gospel, which shows Christ revolutionising the ideas of society in His reception of the woman in the Temple. His words and acts in that case have been my sheet-anchor in all my life's work since then. The significance of these words and acts, it seems to me, have been, to some extent, missed or denied by the Churches from the beginning; and what do I find the learned among the Churches doing now? Labouring to take from me and all women that particular portion of Christ's life and teaching; taking pains to prove to us that this chapter, if not the whole of the Gospel of St. John, is unauthentic and spurious. To one, however, who has come very near to Christ about this question, and has heard Him speak, it does not much matter what divines and scholars may say as to there never having been any such interview (as that recorded) in the Temple. No doubt, it would be a great relief to some men if it could be proved that Christ never pronounced such a word of emancipation for a woman, or so terrible a censure of the sins of men.

In those early days of woman's uprising against inequality in moral matters, we had

and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death: I do not say that he shall pray for it" (1 John. v. 16). These are solemn considerations—dark, impenetrable mysteries. We can only stand with our heads uncovered and bow before the Judge of all the earth; hoping that such a sin as is here described is seldom committed, and that what is impossible with man is possible with God. The judgments of God are a great depth which our feeble reason cannot fathom, and which must be left to the disclosures of a future life. "If Thou Lord shouldst mark iniquity, who can stand? But there is forgiveness with Thee that Thou mayst be feared."

WOMAN'S PLACE IN CHURCH WORK.

BY MRS. JOSEPHINE BUTLER, MRS. SHELDON AMOS, AND MRS. BRAMWELL BOOTH.

From *The Review of the Churches* (London), February, 1892.

I.

MRS. JOSEPHINE BUTLER.

YOU have asked me for a few words on "Woman's Work in the Church." It is perhaps the most difficult subject which could be presented to me to write about. It would be easier for me to speak of the work of women outside the Churches, or, in spite of the Church; and not difficult, though the subject is large, to speak of "Woman's Work for Christ." It seems to me that "the Church" has treated woman very much as "the world"—as Society has treated her, from the earliest days till now. Yet I am not wholly a rebel in this matter. I see that her position would have been far worse but for the light which Christ shed upon it, a few broken rays of which light have been permitted to fall upon her state, athwart the complicated inventions of Churchmen and of men of the world with the name of Christians. In the early Christian days certainly, saintship was acknowledged as attainable by women equally with men; and up to the 12th or 13th century one cannot help observing that in one respect the Church was mindful of the truth that in Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female. I do not think we find in Protestant annals of Christian lives any such recognition of that principle so clear or so eloquent as is to be found in the "Acta

Sanctorum." The "lives of the Saints" (active as well as contemplative Saints) in that noble record include both sexes. It has been a true consolation to me to study those annals, in which the annalists appear gloriously oblivious in many cases as to the sex of the Saints of whom they are writing; who were equally God-appointed messengers to the world, sometimes as active administrators and divinely inspired politicians, as well as teachers, healers, or solitary students of Divine things. I think we Protestants are rather at a loss what to do with our Saints. We put up painted windows, or erect some charitable building in their honour, or write a biography—in the latter case, if the subject be a woman, with more or less of an apology or explanation, for her having a little stepped out of the "woman's sphere" (that prison house for so much that is good) and having encroached a little on the man's field of activity. We have no tribunal for judgment of the standard which merits canonization, no "devil's advocate" of the old style (a very useful person), and no effort on the part of our reformed Churches to gather into one great fragrant bouquet the memories of those among us who have lived nearest to God. Well, perhaps this is for the best, so apt are we to carry our admiration and worship to beings lower than God Himself, and to lapse into idolatry. But we have lost something nevertheless, and women have been the greatest sufferers by the loss.

The shabby, disrespectful way in which I have heard Protestant ministers speak of the Mother of Christ—as if she was the most ordinary of women, a mere instrument and no more—has made me wonder less at the small amount of recognition given in our Churches to the fact that woman is, equally with man, God's minister upon the earth in matters spiritual, though not necessarily chosen to work in precisely the same fashion; no, happily not.

The Church of the first centuries, however, seems, save in the case of exceptionally sainted or gifted women, not to have risen much, if at all, above the accepted theories of the mass of the men of the times, in its treatment of women in general. They were in subjection, often abjectly so. The Church has always allowed herself to be bound, held back, dragged down, more or less, by the overpowering weight of unregenerate male feeling and opinion in this matter, aided, since the Reformation, by the narrow Pauline directions, which (given for the correction of the conduct of silly and ignorant Greek women of the day),

men h
all tim
teachi
ing wh
ciples
Churc
vital r

"W
very v
to me
Churc
tions,
clearly
speak
to ex
augus
ber of
united
centra
of "
Churc
liever
ventu
Churc
edge.
which
you r
differ
with
ness.
come
ing o
in th
their
ly un
positi
been
the c
of th
pries
vision
peop
have
to se
for a
herse
inex
proc
I
rever
for v
to f
spiri
them
and
if d
But
equa
und
high
won

men have elected to apply to all women in all times, and have allowed to override the teaching of Christ on this matter, a teaching which sets in the fullest light the principles which ought to have been dear to the Church, and to have been her guide in this vital matter.

"Woman's Work in the Church." The very words raise up the first great difficulty to me, an unlearned person. What is the Church? I have read the various definitions, and still do not see that people always clearly know what they mean when they speak of the Church. Is the word meant to express a single outward organisation, august, ancient, and venerable; or a number of outward organisations, more or less united by the common acceptance of a great central truth; or the narrow English view of "the Church," the Anglican State Church; or the great spiritual host of believers? In any of these cases I should not venture to write of woman's work "in the Church," for I have not sufficient knowledge. I see in your *Review of the Churches*, which I read with increasing interest, that you record duly work done by women in the different denominations. I read this record with thankfulness—but a limited thankfulness. It proves that Christian men have come on a step or two; that they are coming on, as fast perhaps as one can expect, in the matter of placing women more by their side in all Church work, and not solely under their direction and in subordinate positions. For too long a time women have been graciously permitted only to sweep out the church, to wash the ecclesiastical robes of the Catholic or Protestant popes and priests, to feed the poor under their supervision, and to read the Bible inside poor people's houses. And women themselves have been very slavish. It is humiliating to see a gifted woman, with dignity enough for a Bishop or a Prime Minister, putting herself willingly under the guidance of some inexperienced, *not* gifted clergyboy. The process is very injurious to the clergyboy.

I do not ask that the positions should be reversed. I only desire freedom; freedom for women as well as men, to expand, and to fulfil, in any and every direction, the spiritual destiny of which God has made them capable. Neither do I despise small and even menial services. All are ennobled, if done for love's sake to God and man. But here again there should be freedom and equality. The humblest offices should be undertaken alike by men and women; the highest offices open alike to men and women.

I said that I read the record of the present work of women in the various Churches with a limited thankfulness; limited, because to my ambitious soul *office* seems but a poor thing. To climb any ladder to office, even if it be the highest outward office in Church or State, is not my first ambition for my fellow women.

I am glad to see office attainable by them because it proves that the sense of justice is gaining ground in the minds of men; and I utter daily a hearty "God bless them" for the men whose eyes are so far opened.

But now I must try to come into the presence of Christ. Here, my words labour, and I speak with a sense of utter dependence on the teaching of His Spirit. I speak not as a theologian, nor as yet a deeply taught student of Scripture, but as a woman—a woman who has fought a hard battle, with but partial help, during the burden and heat of the day, from the Churches (and with direct opposition from many members of the Churches), and who was driven to turn quite round, away from all other authority or teaching, and to come, with her broken heart, to the feet of the Master—the only Wise, the only Holy, the only *Just* One. It was a question not so much of woman's work in the Church, as of the equality of men and women in moral matters, in which I believed God had called me to act. I turned to the eighth chapter of St. John's Gospel, which shows Christ revolutionising the ideas of society in His reception of the woman in the Temple. His words and acts in that case have been my sheet-anchor in all my life's work since then. The significance of these words and acts, it seems to me, have been, to some extent, missed or denied by the Churches from the beginning; and what do I find the learned among the Churches doing now? Labouring to take from me and all women that particular portion of Christ's life and teaching; taking pains to prove to us that this chapter, if not the whole of the Gospel of St. John, is unauthentic and spurious. To one, however, who has come very near to Christ about this question, and has heard Him speak, it does not much matter what divines and scholars may say as to there never having been any such interview (as that recorded) in the Temple. No doubt, it would be a great relief to some men if it could be proved that Christ never pronounced such a word of emancipation for a woman, or so terrible a censure of the sins of men.

In those early days of woman's uprising against inequality in moral matters, we had

to bear the condemnation of men high in the churches, even saintly men. I dare to speak of it now because every one of those who wrote to me terrible letters of denunciation and censure (Mr. Spurgeon, Lord Shaftesbury, the late Bishop of Carlisle, and the late Archbishop of York were of the number), repented sooner or later of having so written, and showed his repentance in action. At first they thought that for a woman to know or to speak of certain evils was a monstrous thing—a sin against God.

My only resource was to spread these letters before the Lord, after the manner of Hezekiah, and simply to say to Him, "Thou Lord seest the words of Mr. Spurgeon, Lord Shaftesbury, and the others," and to wait. I waited; and He was faithful. Another learned Bishop who had so written to me, wrote a year later: "Pardon me. I have asked pardon of God. I am a foolish and ignorant old man, but He has shown me how falsely I judged your position." That was a Bishop indeed!

But to return to our more immediate subject. When Jesus called to Him seventy disciples to appoint them as missionaries to their countrymen, it seems there were no women among them; neither were there among the chosen Twelve. Thus it would seem that it was not His design that women should at that time bear the dignity of office in the Church. This has often struck me; and it has strengthened many an argument in favour of closing to women every avenue of exalted service in the Church. But stay! Is office among the "best gifts" which we are to "covet earnestly," or only second-best? And if to women is emphatically granted a higher gift, and even a higher calling, perhaps they may let the other go, and learn to see a deep and gracious meaning, and a divine equality, in Christ's disposition of gifts and offices. Who were the first messengers of the completed Gospel? They were women, who being first at the sepulchre, became, not officially appointed, but divinely-inspired revealers of the highest truth to man. Perhaps the love in their souls made their eyes clearer than men's eyes. They saw first, and first believed, and then eagerly propagated their belief. I am content. No office in the Church can reach to this. "Christ is Risen." "Life has come to the world." Give us freedom; refuse us office if you like, though it would be more just in you to share all offices with women. But give us only freedom in the name and in the Spirit of Christ; and then you shall see

what God may do with women, in the great work of the world's salvation. But you will go on, doubtless, for a time, following in the steps of the Apostles, asking dubiously concerning women's messages, "Idle tales, idle tales, are they not?" "For the words of the women seemed unto them as idle tales." Unto whom? Unto those Apostles who had received that commission from the Master to go and preach and heal throughout the land. When the Church, or the Churches, become more deeply humble; when they have realised, even more than they do now, their desperate need of the help of woman *as man's equal, absolutely*, in her relation to spiritual things, they will grant the freedom we ask; and then good gifts will no longer languish in a prison-house of conventionalities, and women's energies will not have to be folded in napkins and buried under the church floor. The Salvation Army have led the way in this spiritual equality, and emancipation of women's powers. May the Churches follow!

II.

MRS. SHELDON AMOS.

THE two common rival definitions of the Church would involve quite different forms of answer to the question 'what women's work in it properly is. But to my mind the answers would be radically the same. If the question were what women's work has historically been, the matter would be quite different again, because women's work has been narrowed down in the Church as everywhere else to drudgery and toil without recompense, recognition, or honour, and has only been illuminated by its regular self-abnegation, and by the occasional brilliance of some brain and heart that nothing could quench or conceal. The two definitions of the Church make it (1) the company of the true believers under all names, skies, and circumstances, and (2) the ecclesiastical organisations of these believers. I imagine that under the first definition it would be generally held that women's work among the faithful would be admitted to be whatever they can do to increase the number and to promote the welfare of believers; while under the second definition it would be commonly held that women's work was to serve the interests of such organisations in diligent subordination to authority. These are practically the same thing. But they do not appear to me satisfactory. The very existence of the *Review* points to a defini-

tion o
tions
as co-
which
I like
these
what
"the
That
each
Chris
Churc
of the
Heav
No
tion a
begin
comm
over
is cre
was t
he wa
help
After
thing
cause
altho
felt t
tion
tende
domi
ing o
have
two i
ish th
trol t
of da
ity of
snare
the o
have
altho
ity of
and c
culpa
Noah
once
men
Now
be th
on e
plan
inval
life a
and
creat
men.
func
the
child
to or

tion of the Church as consisting of organisations of believers who recognise each other as co-ordinate parts of a great ideal whole, which they strive to realise as a unity. And I like to go further and to think of each of these smaller "Churches" as consisting of what St. Paul speaks of again and again as "the Church that is in so-and-so's house." That is the beau ideal of Christianity, that each house should be a centre of organised Christian life and work, a part of a larger Church, similarly organised, and that part of the one complete and perfect Church in Heaven and on earth.

Now, if we take this as granted, the position and work of women is plain. In the beginning man and woman had the one command given to them to have dominion over the Creation as a whole. The woman is created to be man's helper, not because he was to be saved from drudgery, but because he was not doing well alone. The woman's help was essential to make his life good. After the fall he calls her "Life"—the thing he had come so near forfeiting—"because she was the mother of all living," although she had as yet no children. He felt the essential motherhood in her relation even to the brutes, her capacity for tender care of things she had to exercise dominion over. He leaves to her the naming of the children, whom she declares to have been given to her by God. These are two items of her work: to protect and cherish the creatures, and to educate and control the children. To man falls the routine of daily labour on inanimate nature. Plurality of wives appears soon to have been a snare to men, who probably misunderstood the order to replenish the earth, and must have produced inequality between the sexes, although Lamech acknowledges the authority of his wives in matters concerning life and death, when it is to them that he exculpates himself for homicide. Then, in Noah's time, God sets the matter straight once more by saving an equal number of men and women to replenish the earth. Now, if we take the work of the Church to be the establishing of the Kingdom of God on earth, these early indications of God's plan for the government of the world are invaluable, and they place the questions of life and death, of management of children, and the duty of controlling of the lower creatures, at least equally on women and on men. In the curse there is indeed a lower function assigned to the man, who is to till the ground, while the woman is to bear children. Evil grew, and when Moses had to organise the Jewish Church, the nations

around had become so debased that for a woman to be a priestess, or have any function or office in connection with any pagan religion involved the lowest degradation. The service of the Temple was also, in a large degree, the slaughtering and burning of animals, and involved work peculiarly unsuited for married women. It is, therefore, no matter of surprise that women had no official part in the Jewish Church. They gave freely to the collection for the tabernacle, even devoting their mirrors as well as their ornaments, and spinning and weaving the coverings; and though they were not commanded to go up regularly to the Temple like the men, such accommodation was made for them as shows they were expected to be there in large numbers. Mr. Thomas Lynch used to say that the Lord knew that while the men had to be told to go up, He knew that the women were often hindered, but would go if they could.

As soon as we turn the page from the Old to the New Testament we begin to feel that we have got back to the original idea. I suppose no one would deny that our Lord's birth might have been miraculously ordered in other ways than the one God chose as most suitable to His design. He put honour on a woman of choice, not of necessity. He continued the initial idea that the woman has special hold on life, and once more lifted her up to her original place, from which man's sin and her submission had degraded her. It was not at once obvious. She who had been greeted by the archangel as "highly favoured among women" was supposed by her neighbours to have lost her virtue, but a woman's heart recognised, "shouting with a loud cry," that she was the mother of the Lord. That courageous proclamation by Elizabeth is worthy of imitation, and it is worthy of consideration. Women have always been apt to defer recognition of each other's wonderful gifts until men have or have not seen them; and to that may be attributed a large portion of the paralysis of women's minds, souls, and bodies, from which the Christian Church and the surrounding world suffers. The recognition by the Church of women's gifts is and has been tardy, unwilling, and often completely withheld. And it becomes the duty of women in the Church to lead the way in recognising their own natural women leaders, their own capacities and call. It is better to obey God than man.

There is a great tendency, too, to treat women whose pre-eminence cannot be disputed as quite exceptional beings, quite outside the law which must still restrict the

sphere of ordinary women, and in fact to utilise them as contrasts to deepen the shadows suitable to other women's lives. Such souls in men's bodies are recognised as leaders whose advance gains fresh territory for the men who follow them. The universal church is the loser; not women only. Its hesitation to give men and women equal place in its organisations arises from various causes. One is the Judaism which still prevails in the Christian Church and clips the wings of those who would rise above sacerdotalism. Another cause is the paganism which Greek thought grafted on to Christian doctrine, and which tolerates a theory of impurity in relation to women, and even such subtle laxity of morality as degrades the thought of women who ought to be beacons guiding to purity. Another is the perhaps congenital, but certainly inherited desire of men, as men, to assert authority over women as women, an authority which has no sanction anywhere. Another is the strange belief that St. Paul snubbed women, and that this has not been blown to the winds is largely the fault of slavishly-submissive women. In fact he sends equal greetings to men and women, frequently emphasizing the women's labours with and for him and for Christian societies more than he does men's. He advises that women should wear veils on their heads as a sign of authority and because they are the glory of man as man is the glory of God, and apparently in order to hide the beauty of their hair. One thinks of the veil that Moses wore. Commentators have said that wearing the veil was to show they were under authority, or that they derived authority from men. But St. Paul does not say that. He does say that he does not suffer the women to teach at Corinth, but he does not suggest that they were not able to do it. In fact he again advises the women to cover their heads in public assemblies in order that things may go on peaceably in what are otherwise shown to be very disorderly communities.

There is every reason for women to stand on the original idea and command of God, to which the Redemption has restored us, of equality and identity of dominion, of capacity, and so of responsibility for the setting up of the Kingdom of God on earth, which is the Church's vocation. Women must, like Elizabeth, loudly recognise the coming of their Lord, even before the shepherds or the aged priest. To some of them such prophetic discernment is given, and woe is them if they fail in its use from cowardice, or false modesty, or the restraints

of custom. The women whose record runs like a golden thread through the whole Bible have been such as Miriam, who led the host of Israel with songs, Deborah, who broke the customary reserve of the Jewish woman to save and to judge and reorganise her country, Esther, who risked life and all and waged a successful single-handed warfare against the all-powerful Haman for the deliverance of her people, Elizabeth, Mary, the woman whose faith was the greatest our Lord had met with, the woman whose sense of her need of healing overcame all natural shrinking from publicity, the woman of Samaria, who was so well snubbed by the men for bearing testimony to Christ, the group who followed Him far outside the city when the disciples had all fled; the three who alone cared to go early to the sepulchre to tend the body of the executed malefactor in spite of the Roman soldiers there. These were all content to do unusual things at the bidding of their consciences. Such courage is what women need to show in these days. Calmly, steadily, though sometimes "lifting up their voices with a loud cry," give themselves to set the household of faith in order and take their proper place of authority in it. St. Paul says it is his will that they should rule the household. Those who with open eyes study the condition of that part of the world which calls itself Christendom, and in that Christendom the society which passes by the name of Christian, and in that again what calls itself the Church of Christ know only too well how dark the dark places are, how full of lust and avarice, and cruelty, and greed, and all that is opposed to God. And it is not they who would hinder Christian women from efforts in the strength of God to bring the light of the Gospel into these dark places.

III.

MRS. BRAMWELL BOOTH.

It is some time since George Fox, and later John Wesley, strove against the evil of priestly monopoly, and led the advance guard of lay-preachers and workers, which have since done such noble service in the Lord's battlefield. The victory is perhaps even now only partially gained, and much yet remains to be done; nevertheless, a prejudice, which in their day had been made almost invulnerable by ignorance, has been largely removed. From quarters, whence no help was ever expected, have come some of the most powerful auxiliaries to the

cause
Charc
sands
been h
and th

Just
is, I t
a leade
God h
Woma
cross v
the po
and th
fight t
Master

Mar
that t
Army.
been e
lating
Churo
tion o
of cu
lead,
plishe
tensio

Out
(excep
no on
inequ
an.
has so
Wom
teach
breth
niver
by ta
ment
man
the c
main
regar

Is
and r
to jo
were
all v
day-s
moth
any
made
digni
expro
leagu
breth
equa
put t
vinel
there
the m
toril

cause of Christ, and the armies of the Church Militant are richer by many thousands of soldiers than they could ever have been had the victory of the local preacher and the lay-helper never been won.

Just such another battle in another cause is, I think, now contesting. For this also a leader is not wanting. The man whom God has chosen has espoused the cause of *Woman*, and, among the soldiers of the cross whom he leads on to war, she is given the position which rightly belongs to her, and the opportunity for fighting the good fight to which she has been called by her Master.

Many have expressed it as their opinion that the direct results of the Salvation Army, wonderful as they are, have even been exceeded by the indirect, in the stimulating effect of its example upon the Churches. If in this also—the emancipation of woman from the traditional boycott of custom—the Churches still follow its lead, as much, if not more, will be accomplished as in any other direction for the extension of God's kingdom.

Outside the ranks of the Salvation Army (except, in perhaps, the Society of Friends) no one can fail to see that there is a vast inequality in the position of man and woman. The Deaconess Phoebe of Cenchrea has scarcely a counterpart in our Churches. Women may visit the sick, it is true, may teach in the Sunday-school, may make the brethren comfortable by hard toiling at anniversary festivities, and even amuse them by taking part in public church entertainments, but to place them on a level with man in work, to give them any position in the control of, or responsibility for, the main business of the Church, seems to be regarded as an unmixed evil.

Is it not a fact that many eminent divines and ministers would feel compelled to refuse to join in any public meeting if a woman were included among the speakers? "It is all very well for a lady to teach in the Sunday-school, or to tell a few anecdotes to a mothers' meeting, but she is not fit to take any more important work," was a remark made a short time since by an important dignitary of the Church of England, and it expresses the opinion of many of his colleagues and even of his Nonconformist brethren. All arguments in favour of an equal position for the sexes are summarily put to silence by what is considered the Divinely-sanctioned prohibition of Paul. (If there is any real difficulty on this point in the mind of the reader, it will be satisfactorily solved by a careful reading of Mrs.

General Booth's pamphlet entitled "*Female Ministry; or, Woman's Right to Preach the Gospel.*")

This state of affairs is so much a matter of custom and prejudice, that it has largely become a second nature. It is difficult for many, who would willingly sacrifice cherished opinions when convinced of their error, to realise how widely in our treatment of women we differ from the early Christians, and how grievously we have diverged from the directions and intentions of the Churches' Head.

It is a cause of continual thankfulness to me that my circumstances have been such that I was but very slightly brought under the power of religious customs. Prejudice here seems able to take deeper root than elsewhere, and indeed seems sometimes ineradicable. All my practical religious experience has been gained in the ranks of the Salvation Army, by the voice of whose sainted mother the Holy Spirit first brought to my heart the glad tidings of the Saviour of the world. I have found in our Army family the fullest opportunity for the exercise of all a woman's powers, a sphere of work to employ all her energy, a boundless occasion for the wealth of her heart's deepest affections, and the largest scope for her highest ambitions. To me, and to my comrades trained in like liberty, it seems as natural for woman to take a prominent place in the Church family as in the home.

To the English matron accustomed to rule her own household, and if circumstances make it necessary, to take the husband's place as the head of the family, the unnatural restrictions of her sisters in India are deplorable. She hears with sorrow of the horrible living deaths of the wives and children of the high-class opium-smoker, prevented by the national customs from earning their own living, not allowed to go out to market, or to take part in any outside work, and compelled therefore to wait in the retirement of the harem the pleasure of their lord and master. If he sacrifices their interests and the money which should support them on his lust for the deadly narcotic, his wives and little ones must slowly starve, helpless to help themselves. The parallel which exists in the restrictions on woman's liberty prevailing in the Christian Church at the present time seems to me none the less disastrous, and, practically, delegates women to spiritual seclusion and starvation in a like manner.

Many of the shortcomings and failings quoted to prove the incapability and unsuitability of the sex to be trusted with further

responsibility, and therefore to justify the restrictions placed on them, are brought about by these very trammels. Give women more work and authority, and they will cease to be idlers and gossips. Qualities and capacities undreamed of at present will surprise those who have hitherto regarded the female members of the Church as little more than a species of pious peacock or religious magpie! It is the old story of the decay and final disappearance of powers which are not exercised. Uselessness is the inevitable Nemesis of idleness.

What are the arguments that can be urged against women occupying a far more important position in the Church than she holds at present—indeed, are there any sufficient reasons against her taking a position of equality with the other sex? I do not know of any, nor have I ever met anybody that did. It seems to me that, no matter how weighty they may be, there is much that is weightier still on the other side. The essential qualifications necessary to become a true member of the Church, are they not open alike to women as to men? They are not such as are more easily obtained by man than woman, and are as frequently, if not more often, brought to their highest degree of perfection in the latter. Will any one dare to declare that woman has not an equal right with man to the salvation obtained by Jesus Christ, an equal responsibility to shine as a light in the world, to endure hardness as a good soldier, and to prove if needs be (as hundreds of women have) by facing death in its most horrible forms, the power of witnessing grace?

On the Day of Pentecost, *the women*, who had shared His shame even when the brethren all forsook Him and fled, had watched by His gloomy sepulchre when the brethren were away debating what they should do next, and whose eyes were first blessed with a sight of their Risen Lord—**THE WOMEN** were with one accord waiting for and expecting the promise to be fulfilled for themselves, as for the men. They were not disappointed. They had heard their Lord's voice equally with their brethren, and they also now heard the sound from Heaven as of a mighty rushing wind, and were not afraid, but lifting their heads, in expectation of answered prayer, the outward sign of the supernatural gift they had received was seen to sit on each of them. Then was the promise fulfilled which was to be accomplished a hundred and a thousand times in all the centuries since: "Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy;" and that

there be no mistake, "Also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out My spirit." Not only to the distinguished and respected women, but to the most insignificant of their race, to the female slaves, was this, the one great essential, nay the one only qualification of Christian fellowship and Christian service, promised and bestowed.

The fruits of this blessing, are they not such as may be cultivated by the Spirit in the fullest measure in the heart of a woman as of a man? Whose heart is more quickly moved by love, or who more readily returns love again for love bestowed; whose spirit can more deeply, truly delight in the joy of the Lord and give Him more truly the simple faith of a child, than a woman's? Longsuffering and gentleness, are these not almost naturally her qualifications? and nowhere do they reign more powerfully than upon the throne of a woman's sanctified heart.

To grant that she is weak, that she comes behind in intellectual power, is but to establish her claim; for "God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty."

What a glorious roll-call might we not give, and what thousands will only be known as they answer to their names at the last great roll-call of the nations—not of exceptional Deborahs merely, but of ordinary so-called weak women, who have obtained a good report by faith, and walked worthy of their high vocation!

The position of women in the Jewish Dispensation and the Christian economy was a brilliant contrast. In the present day the contrast seems to me to be actually reversed! While in every other sphere—in the family as wife and mother, or as daughter and heiress, in politics, in science, in art, and in labour—woman is day by day improving her position, and claiming and securing equal rights with the man for whose completeness she was made, the last, and I would almost say the highest, work of her Creator, in the Church she is still silent, subordinate, and largely unoccupied. To be a woman means for the most part to have little or no responsibility there, to have no place in the testimony of praise or the voice of prayer.

In a powerful country, upon the throne of which, during a period of nearly sixty years, revered and loved by all her people, a woman has worn the Imperial crown, what can there be of incongruity in afford-

ing son
for th
Church
abound
and th
service
and br

Are
has ch
applic
good
He no
never
chang
tempo
life, b
the sp
impor
shoul
meet f
has in
tation
lap-do
He ser
first C
shoul
sponsi
she w
Wh
fulfil
realise

THE
PR
MA
VI

BY

From

IN
of Ja
lent i
option
solute
that
etern
affirm
nial
paper
teach
differ
regar
reason
ciding

ing some share in the definite responsibility for the direction and control of their Churches to women—and I am sure they abound—who are, by their piety, their gifts, and their aspirations, as well fitted for the service of God and man as their husbands and brethren?

Are not the principles upon which God has chosen to govern the world of perpetual application? When He said: "It is not good that the man should be alone," was He not giving expression to a law which has never changed, and which never will change? It cannot apply merely to the temporal and physical conditions of a man's life, but in the intellectual, the moral, and the spiritual realm must also be of supreme importance. "It is not good that the man should be alone. I will make him an helpmeet for him." An helpmeet! The world has in practice put every possible interpretation on the term, from a paramour to a lap-dog. Surely God's meaning was, when He sent her into the Garden of Eden—that first Church of His own planting—that she should be a sharer in the privileges, the responsibilities, and the authority of the man she was to help.

When will the women of Israel arise and fulfil the high prophecies of the Bible, and realise the boundless promises of their God?

THE SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD IN PREDESTINATION AS HELD BY MANY REPRESENTATIVE CALVINISTIC THEOLOGIANs.

BY REV. G. W. NORTHRUP, D.D., LL.D.

From *The Standard* (Bapt.), Chicago, February 11, 1892.

II.

IN an article published in the *Standard* of Jan. 14 we considered the widely prevalent idea of the sovereignty of God, as an optional power in virtue of which he is absolutely free to will the exact opposite of that which he does will in regard to the eternal destiny of every human being, and affirmed that it involved, logically, the denial of the divine benevolence. In this paper we propose to examine the view which teaches that there is *nothing* in the way of difference between men to which God has regard as among the grounds, or causes, or reasons, or conditions, of his action in deciding to whom to extend, and from whom

to withhold, renewing and pardoning grace. This conception of divine sovereignty differs somewhat from the one previously considered as will be apparent in the course of the discussion.

THE CONCEPTION AS DEFINED.

Westminster Confession, chapter III., 5, "Those of mankind who are predestinated unto life, God . . . hath chosen in Christ . . . without any foresight of faith, or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or *any other thing* in the creature, as conditions, or causes moving him thereunto."

Cunningham, the Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation, 434—"The Calvinistic doctrine is, that, in making the selection of some men and in resolving to save them, God was not influenced by anything existing in them, or foreseen in them, by which they were distinguished from other men, or by any reason known to, or comprehensible by us, but only by his own good pleasure."

Hodge, *Outlines of Theology*, 206,—"The decrees of God are sovereign in the sense that while they determine absolutely whatever occurs without God, their whole reason and motive is within the divine nature, and they are neither suggested by, nor conditioned upon, anything whatever without him." The position which we shall attempt to establish in this discussion is that the theory that in forming the decrees of election and preterition (non-election, rejection) God acted irrespective of *any difference* between those appointed to these infinitely diverse destinies, necessarily implies purely arbitrary and capricious action in dealing with mankind.

That the decree of individual election necessarily involves the antithetic decree of individual rejection (non-election, preterition) is affirmed by the great body of representative Calvinists—Calvin, Turretin, Ridgley, Owen, Gill, Dick, Cunningham, Edwards, Hodge, Shedd, Patton. Two quotations will express the view of all. Dick, *Lectures on Theology*, 191—"Election and rejection are correlative terms, and men impose on themselves and imagine that they conceive what it is impossible for them to conceive, when they admit election and deny reprobation. When of several objects some are chosen, the rest are rejected. It is of no purpose to say that nothing has been done to them, but that they are left in the state in which they were found. In one sense this is true, and in another sense

it is not true: because, as they might have been chosen, but were not, there has been an act of the mind refusing to choose them."

Shedd, "Proposed Revision," etc., 41, 42, "Preterition is the contrary of election and one of two contraries implies the other. . . . No one should contend that there is an election of individuals but not a preterition. . . . It is impossible to think of individual election by itself, or to teach it alone by itself. To affirm in a creed the decree of individual election, and to deny that of preterition, is the height of absurdity."

"This position would seem to be an inexorable logical necessity, being demanded, as President Patton remarks, by the axiom that the whole is greater than its part.

THE QUESTION TO BE CONSIDERED.

That God loves all men in the sense of having a desire to save each and every one, is made certain by the plainest declarations of the Bible: John iii. 16, "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that *whosoever* believeth on him should not perish but have eternal life;" 1 Tim. ii. 4, "God our Saviour *willeth* that *all* men should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth;" 2 Peter, iii. 9, "The Lord is long-suffering to you-ward, *not wishing* that any should perish, but that *all* should come to repentance;" 1 John ii. 2, "Jesus Christ is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but *also* for (the sins of) the whole world;" Rom. xi. 32, "For God hath shut up all unto disobedience, that he might have mercy upon *all*." Since Jesus Christ is "the image of the invisible God," (Col. i. 15,) "the effulgence of his glory and the very image of his substance," (Heb. i. 3,) since he and the Father are one in nature and spirit (John xiv. 9), we must regard his words recorded in Luke xiii. 34, xix. 41, 42 as a most tender and pathetic expression of divine compassion towards those whose wickedness was rapidly rising to its culmination: "O, Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, *and ye would not*." "And when he was come near, he beheld the city, and wept over it, saying, If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace!"

In view of these and numerous other passages of similar import there can be no question that in the work of salvation God was

moved wholly by causes lying in himself—his spontaneous and infinite compassion for the souls of men. The question which we are to consider in this paper is, whether of two individuals between whom there is *no difference* as regards the total reasons of his action, God ordains one to eternal life, and decides "to pass by" the other.

It is of course admitted by the advocates of this theory that there are differences many and great between men in intellectual endowments, in learning, in adaptation to usefulness, in the boldness with which they defy the authority and trample upon the laws of God, in their attitude toward the appointed means of grace, etc. But these and all other differences are held to be of no account as regards the matter in hand,—they furnish not only no "moving causes" but no "conditions" of those divine discriminations which decide the eternal destinies of the members of our race.

But if there is *no difference* between men which God takes into account in determining whom to elect and whom to reject or pass by; if men are, as regards the grounds, or causes, or reasons, or conditions of his decisions so absolutely alike that omniscience can discern no difference between them, then to say that he *discriminates* between them in view of certain inscrutable reasons lying in his own nature, is to use words to which no possible meaning can be attached. According to this representation the purpose to save certain individuals and to "pass by" the rest, must be regarded as purely arbitrary—there being *no* motive for electing or rejecting one man *rather than* another.

It will not remove or lessen this difficulty to say that there may be reasons in the universe apart from men in view of which the decrees of election and rejection are formed. Reasons, whether lying in the nature of God, or existing in the universe viewed apart from man, cannot render the choice between objects which are identical in his regard conceivable, much less rational and wise. The only tenable position which can be taken is, that it was in the highest degree worthy of God to propose to extend saving grace to some and to withhold it from others; but as regards the *particular individuals* to be embraced in these respective classes it was to him a matter of absolute indifference; a position which compels us to hold that his purposes would have been as wise and glorious if they had been reversed, as regards the individuals included in them;—those having been elected who were reprobated—Pharaoh, Ahab, Herod, Judas, etc., and

those
ham,
Judas

A
used
proce
comes
for p
shoul
ence
chose
it is
death
these
reason

Th
vious
certai
requi
ishme
gardi
ing t
units
ticult
wrath
eastin
ment
God
porta
analo
rather
ing,
high
comp
etern
we a
plies
ing r
vidua
graci
ing s
inevi

It
the c
1.
part
peris
crim
inate
part
2.
in th
veal
not
heav
his
thou
3.

those reprobated who were elected—Abraham, David, Paul, Augustine, Edwards, Judson, etc.

A good illustration and one sometimes used to set forth this method (?) of divine procedure is the following: A regiment becomes insubordinate and it is deemed best, for public reasons, that some of the men should be shot. But as there is no difference between the men why some should be chosen for punishment rather than others, it is decided to select by lot and punish with death every tenth man. "The death of these particular men is for reasons, but the reasons are not in the men."

The application of the illustration is obvious. Men have rebelled against God and certain reasons, unrevealed and inscrutable, require that some should receive the punishment which all deserve. And so disregarding all differences between men, viewing them as a mass of indistinguishable units, God decides the question of the particular men to be ordained to dishonor and wrath in a manner as arbitrary as that of casting lots for the decimation of a regiment. Is it credible that the infinitely wise God acts, in a matter of transcendent importance, in a manner in the slightest degree analogous to this clumsy, non-moral, or rather immoral human expedient? Granting, as we must grant, that there are the highest reasons why the infinitely wise and compassionate God purposed not to bestow eternal life upon a part of mankind; can we accept a theory which necessarily implies that he acted without reason in selecting rather than others the particular individuals to whom he refuses to grant the gracious help without which their everlasting sin and misery is not only certain, but inevitable?

THE DIFFICULTY TO BE MET.

It is essential that we see clearly just what the difficulty is which confronts us here.

1. It is not that God purposed to save a part of our race and to leave the rest to perish in their sins; "for in the case of criminals the pardon of some does not originate a claim, in justice, for pardon on the part of others."

2. It is not that the reasons of God's acts in this affair are regarded as not only unrevealed, but of such a nature that they cannot be made known to us; "for as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are his ways higher than our ways, and his thoughts higher than our thoughts."

3. It is not that in all his dealings with

mankind God acts from reasons lying in himself, for this would be true were he to regenerate those whom he leaves in unregeneracy and to leave in unregeneracy those whom he regenerates.

4. But the absolutely fatal objection is that the theory under discussion excludes every possible reason, known or unknown, for discriminating between mankind—the elect and the non-elect being as regards the total reasons or conditions of his action as absolutely alike as are the parts of space or the moments of duration; a position which logically implies, as we have said, that though it was in the highest degree worthy of God to extend saving grace to some and to withhold it from others, the question of the particular individuals to be embraced in these respective purposes, must have been to him a matter of entire indifference. And does not this compel us to believe that his decisions respecting the eternal life or the eternal death of the members of our race are as arbitrary as they would be were he to determine *by lot* the destiny of every man?

Again, the universe, physical and moral, is one system—the unfolding of one eternal plan, embracing all things that have been, that are and that shall be, all parts of which stand to each other and to the whole in definite and fixed relations. Inductive science teaches that the physical creation is a system of necessarily-related and inter-dependent substances and forces, all ceaselessly acting and re-acting upon each other. The creation or the annihilation of a world or of an atom, would affect instantly and forever every world and every atom to the utmost bounds of the material system. The history of the human race is a development in which all individuals and all events sustain to each other necessary, natural, and organic relations. The history of our world—one person or one event being left out—would present a problem which no intelligence, finite or infinite, could solve.

Now it is certain that men differ from each other in many respects, and if God does not take these differences into account in forming the decrees of election and preterition, they exist all the same, and necessarily become important factors in the world's history. If God had appointed some other man than Abraham to be the founder of the Jewish nation, or some other man than Paul to be the apostle to the Gentiles, or some other man than Luther to inaugurate the Reformation, the course of events in the world would have differed beyond our power of conception from its actual course. Or if he had decreed to regenerate

those whom he decreed to leave in unregeneracy, and to leave in unregeneracy those whom he decreed to regenerate, the history of our race would have been infinitely different from what it has been and will be.

But if there is no difference between men to which, as foreseen, God had respect in deciding whom to elect and whom to pass by, there can be no difference in his view, in point of excellency or perfection, between the diverse courses of events in the world's history as determined by these men, according as they are elected or rejected. If of two individuals, A and B, the election of A and the rejection of B would be necessary to the most perfect plan of the world's government, and the election of B and the rejection of A would be inconsistent with that plan, then it would not be optional with God to elect B and to reject A, for it cannot be optional with God to adopt any other than the most wise and perfect plan of the world's government. Hence, whatever decrees God might have formed there could have been no difference in his view in point of perfection as expressions of his manifold attributes, between the infinitely diverse results in history according to the infinitely diverse ways in which he was free to exercise his sovereignty in determining the destiny of the individuals of our race. But the human race is a part—perhaps the most important part—of God's universal empire; a part of that hierarchy of spiritual beings, rising rank above rank in power and dignity, the crowning glory of all his works. And as every individual must affect the world's history differently according as he is appointed to be a "vessel of mercy," or a "vessel of wrath," so every individual must make the whole universe infinitely different, in some respects, according as he is appointed to dwell with the devil and his angels, or to dwell forever with Jesus Christ. Hence, there must have been an infinite number of diverse plans of creation, precisely equal or identical in his esteem, as manifestations of his perfections.

1. The plan which he adopted including the election of a certain number and the preterition of a certain number was infinitely wise and perfect.

2. Had he adopted a plan which involved the reversal of these decrees as regards the individuals embraced in them—the election of those reprobated and the reprobation of those elected, it would have been infinitely wise and perfect.

3. Had he adopted any one of the infinity of possible plans which would have embraced the election of one or more of those repro-

bated and the reprobation of one or more of those elected it would have been infinitely worse and perfect. And according to the idea of sovereignty considered in our former paper—

4. Had he adopted a plan which included the reprobation of all it would have been infinitely wise and perfect.

5. Had he adopted a plan which included the salvation of all it would have been infinitely wise and perfect.

All these supposable plans, infinite in number and diversity, were, it is affirmed, optional with God, and therefore, so exactly equivalent or identical in excellency as expressions of his essential glory, that omniscience itself could discern no difference between them. Hence, in adopting the present plan, in preference to all others he made a choice—or rather he performed an act—for which he could give no reason to his own mind, which is the very essence of arbitrariness—the action of will unregulated by intelligence.

It is worthy of notice in this discussion that Edwards, Chalmers, Turretin and many other Calvinists adopt the principle of "philosophical necessity" as of universal application, as the law of the divine mind and of all finite intelligences. Every rational being must choose according to the last dictate of the understanding as to what is best or most desirable. The idea of an alternative choice in any case is declared to be absurd. Edwards, ii. 146—"If God's will is steadily and surely determined in everything by supreme wisdom, then it is in everything necessarily determined to that which is most wise. It is no more to God's dishonor to be necessarily wise than to be necessarily holy. And if neither of them be to his dishonor, then it is not to his dishonor necessarily to act holily and wisely. And if it be not dishonorable to be necessarily holy and wise, in the highest possible degree, no more is it mean and dishonorable to act holily, and wisely in the highest possible degree; or, which is the same thing, to do that, in every case which above all other things is wisest and best."

Edwards discusses at length the objection to his view, "that in many instances we must suppose there is absolutely no difference between various possible objects of choice which God has in view," and urges in reply, that "it is a thousand to one—yea, an infinite number to one—that there are no two things in the universe exactly alike." And yet the theory that the decrees of election and preterition were formed irrespective of any difference between men self-evidently

implies an infinite equal choice of choices of

To c there i supposi sions in tion ca pure a the pos differen respect yet " there a is as ce into ac tinies d does so tions a

Even Semi-l erate a take p view th determ than a We manne

1. A represe regard theory based, ance a same t tween tion is pentan lief. I is unso death accept clusive soul, c holy d tion c exercis renew new li Tho "a re

implies the existence in the mind of God of an infinite number of systems, precisely equal or identical in the only respect in which he can regard them as possible objects of choice, viz : their excellency as manifestations of his essential perfections.

To conclude the discussion of this point ; there is one, and in our judgment, but one supposable way by which the divine decisions in the matter of election and non-election can be vindicated against the charge of pure arbitrariness, viz : the acceptance of the position that there is *some* difference or differences between men to which God has respect which are, if not "moving causes," yet "conditions," of his decisions. As there are, in fact, differences among men, it is as certain that he takes these differences into account in determining the diverse destinies of men in the future world as that he does so in determining their diverse conditions and careers in this world.

IMPLIED SOLUTIONS.

Every theological system — Pelagian, Semi-Pelagian, Arminian, Calvinistic, moderate and strict, either explicitly assert, or take positions which involve, logically, the view that there is *something* in men which determines God in choosing one man rather than another.

We will attempt in the briefest possible manner to justify this statement.

THE ARMINIANS.

1. Arminianism may be considered as representing all non-Calvinistic systems as regards the point under consideration. This theory is that the purpose of election is based, or conditioned, on foreseen repentance and faith, and perseverance in the same till death. The difference, then, between men to which God has respect in election is the radical difference between repentance and faith, impenitence and unbelief. But we believe that this representation is unscriptural, that renewal—passing from death to life—is not an act of will—the acceptance of Jesus Christ—but is the exclusive work of God, at the center of the soul, changing its moral bias, originating a holy disposition which abides as the foundation of all holy activity. When a man exercises repentance and faith he is already renewed—these acts are expressions of the new life.

Though man has a measure of freedom, "a remainder of liberty," in the exercise of

which his acts, under divine grace, may have a decisively favorable bearing upon his eternal destiny, it is not an ability by virtue of which he can will himself from darkness into light, from death into life,—can create himself anew in Jesus Christ. He is not, of course, passive, listless, inert, but is active, often intensely so, before and at the time of renewal ; but in the origination of the new life he has no agency. At times the Holy Spirit flashes the illuminating and burning rays of divine truth into the soul, dispelling its darkness, starting into intense action the dormant and deadly principles of sin, setting the conscience on fire, awakening regret, shame, fear, remorse, appealing to the higher and nobler aspirations which sin has not destroyed, and which point the soul to the height from which it has fallen ; prompting to intense and persevering efforts, to arduous and agonizing struggles, to obtain eternal life. But these manifold activities are not the new life, they have no inherent power to produce spiritual renovation, they might continue forever with no other result than that of intensifying the soul's opposition to God. But in the midst of these varied activities of reason, conscience, sensibility and will,—beneath them all, below conscience itself, at the centre of the soul, there is a divine touch opening the blind eyes, emancipating the enslaved will, and calling into exercise faith, and love, and hope, and every other spiritual principle of our being. Thus repentance and faith are, in the logical order, subsequent to regeneration, which is the exclusive work of God, and which necessarily presupposes an eternal purpose of salvation.

SOME CALVINISTS.

2. The view somewhat prevalent among Calvinists that benevolence is the fundamental ethical perfection of God, necessarily implies that there are differences among men which determine God in the formation of his decrees ; furnishing a reason or condition, one and the same, in the case of all the elect, to which he had respect in deciding to elect them rather than to pass them by ; and a reason, one and the same, in the case of all those passed by, to which he had respect in deciding to leave them in sin rather than to save them. This reason or condition is the relation of every man to the end which is of paramount value in his esteem—the greatest good of creation. He purposed to deal with every man according to the immutable requirement of this supreme end ; to elect such and so many as

are necessary to secure the greatest aggregate good of the universe. Had he decided to save the whole world, or to save all, or even one of those whom he decided to refuse to save, he would have defeated the end of infinite benevolence, choosing an inferior in preference to a superior good, which would be a denial of himself. He decides to deliver men from sin, or to leave them in sin, according as these diverse destinies will enhance, in the highest degree, the happiness of the universe. This theory clearly implies, in the strong language once widely current in our country, as expressive of the teaching of one of its most logical and powerful advocates, "that we ought to be willing to be damned for the glory of God," in case our existence in misery forever were necessary to the greatest aggregate good of the rational creation.

As the perdition of a part of mankind is essential to this end, and as the divine plan, determined in all its parts by this end, may include any member of our race, it was urged that men ought to be willing and even to desire to be damned for the glory of God, or for the promotion of the end which has the first place in his regard and which is identical with his glory. Not a few Christians were driven to despair, in the first half of the present century, because of their failure to find satisfactory evidence of their regenerate state by the application of this cruel and absurd test. They found in themselves not only no willingness, but a most vehement unwillingness, to go to hell for the greatest good of the universe, or for any other reason. Is it not extraordinary that a theory should have advocates among Christian thinkers which finds the ultimate explanation of all the sin and misery in the universe in the divine purpose to advance a part of the moral creation to the summit of honor and blessedness? Is it not axiomatically certain that there is not a being in the universe confirmed in holiness who would not unhesitatingly choose to share with all mankind a degree of good however low, than to enjoy a degree of good however high, on condition of the everlasting sin and anguish of even one human being? And can it be otherwise than axiomatically certain that the infinitely holy and benevolent God could not purpose to consign one soul to the endless misery of hell merely in order to secure to the rest a higher measure of blessedness?

We reject, therefore, the idea which this theory presents as to the nature of the difference between men to which God has respect in determining the diverse conditions of men in the future world, viz.: the neces-

sary relation of these states to the greatest good of creation.

MOST CALVINISTS.

3. But the great body of Calvinists hold that the final end of God in creation is not the greatest aggregate good of his creatures, but the perfect revelation of his attributes. This is the glory of God, the excellency of his acts as determined by the law of his own absolute ethical perfection. Whether he calls into existence one or innumerable orders of moral beings; whether he permits the fall of none, or of a part, or of all these beings; whether he saves all the fallen, or none, or a part of them; whether he annihilates the incorrigible, or keeps them in existence forever; whenever, and however he acts, on earth, in heaven, or in hell, his final end is one and the same, to do what is most worthy of himself as a Being of infinite excellency. Whatever he can do consistently with this supreme rule of action to promote the well-being of all personal agents it is infallibly certain that he will do, but he will not, because he *cannot*, put forth one act derogatory to himself to save one order or all orders of personal agents from self-ruin.

Now the execution of his eternal decrees of election and reprobation is an essential part of God's perfect self-revelation. Is it credible that he is determined in all his acts by the purpose to make the most perfect self-revelation, and yet that in the matter of predestination he acts irrespective of all differences between men, differences, which are, in fact, great even in the case of any two individuals who are the most alike, and which must render the universe infinitely different according as the one or the other is ordained unto life? It is said that "we cannot discover any general rule in God's dealings, unless it be this, that in election God seeks to illustrate the greatness and variety of his grace—the reasons lying, therefore, not in men, but in God." Would the fact that a physician were moved by reasons lying in himself—his benevolence or his desire to display his skill, prevent him from taking into account any differences between his patients as "conditions" of his diverse treatment? And if God in election seeks "to illustrate the greatness and variety of his grace," there must be *something* in the men chosen by virtue of which they are better fitted than those passed by, to the end in view. If their superior fitness for "illustrating the greatness and variety of his grace," is not the "moving cause,"

it cert
of his
equall
trati
grace
rule
chose
two m
the en
tradit
elect
of sup
lying
gener
from
betwe
cious
lying
again
but t
discri
to ev
differ
tween
motiv
reason

The
nected
chose
saying
Chris
sinner
this c
chief
long
shoul
life."
the re
chose
ners.
the ap
ness
diti
This
us, gi
why
contr
nothi
choic
positi
istic
destin
ceden
action
393—
etern
to all
kind

it certainly is the indispensable "condition" of his action in electing them. Of two men *equally* suited to be the means of "illustrating the greatness and variety of his grace" he could not, under the supposed rule of action, without pure arbitrariness, choose one and reject the other. And of two men *differing* in fitness in relation to the end in view, he could not, without contradicting the principle of action suggested, elect the one of inferior and reject the one of superior fitness. God acts from "reasons lying in himself" in dealing with the regenerate, but this does not prevent him from taking into account the differences between them in his providential and gracious discipline. He acts from "reasons lying in himself"—his holy displeasure against sin—in punishing the incorrigible but this fact does not prevent him from discriminating between them and rendering to every one according to his guilt. The differences between the regenerate and between the incorrigible, if not the immanent motives of his action, are yet among the reasons of his diverse treatment.

PAUL'S TESTIMONY.

The Apostle Paul mentions one fact connected with himself as a reason why he was chosen, 1 Tim. i. 15, 16: "Faithful is the saying and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief. Howbeit, for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me as chief might Jesus Christ show forth his long suffering for an example of those who should hereafter believe on him to eternal life." In this passage Paul declares that the reason, or one of the reasons, why God chose him was that he was the chief of sinners. We have here a statement made by the apostle of a reason in himself, the greatness of his sins, which determined or conditioned the act of God in his election. This declaration touching the point before us, giving a reason or one of the reasons why he was chosen, seems to us an explicit contradiction of the position that there is *nothing* in men which determines God's choice of one man rather than another; a position involved in the Augustino-Calvinistic theory that the decrees of God in predestination are, in the logical order, antecedent to and independent of all personal action as foreseen. Mozley, *Predestination*, 393—"Augustine and Calvin alike hold an eternal divine decree, which, antecedently to all action, separates one portion of mankind from another, and ordains one to ever-

lasting life and the other to everlasting punishment. That is the fundamental statement of both; and it is evident that while this fundamental statement is the same there can be no substantial difference in the two doctrines. This statement is the sum and substance of the doctrine of predestination."

Paul's personal sins as foreseen could not, therefore, have been on this hypothesis, a reason, or cause, or condition of the bestowment of mercy upon him. God bestowed mercy upon Paul because he eternally purposed to do so, and the reason for the actual bestowment of saving grace must be the same as that which caused or determined the purpose to bestow it. And since the greatness of his sins was a cause, or reason, or condition of God's act in renewing and pardoning him, the greatness of his sins *as foreseen* must have been among the considerations causing or determining God to bestow renewing and pardoning grace. But this is a demonstrable logical impossibility according to the theory we are examining, which teaches that the *foresight* of the personal action of men is, in the logical order, subsequent to and dependent upon the decrees of election and preterition. Hence, it is impossible, that Paul's sins as *foreseen* could have been a ground or a cause, or a condition, or an occasion of God's decree to make him a vessel of mercy. But the apostle declares explicitly that the reason why God chose him was that he was so great a sinner.

There is another statement of Paul respecting himself equally irreconcilable with this theory: 1 Tim. i. 13—"But I obtained mercy because I did it ignorantly in unbelief." In this passage the apostle clearly implies that if he had blasphemed Christ and persecuted his church, knowing the truth concerning him, he would have excluded himself from the possibility of divine mercy. But the view before us teaches that God's decree to bestow mercy on Paul was formed in absolute independence of the *foresight* of his personal action; that during his whole career of wickedness he was acting under the dealing of God with him as embraced in the purpose of election from the first moment of his antenatal existence, and with sole regard to his legal and moral condition as unborn; that, consequently, the foresight of his personal sins, of whatever magnitude they might have been, could have had no influence in preventing the bestowment of mercy; that it was because he had already been made the recipient of mercy in God's purpose of election that he

has kept from committing the sins which would have excluded him from the possibility of forgiveness. These declarations are not inconsistent with each other; they teach that while the greatness of the sinner's sin may be a reason for the bestowment of mercy, his sins may be of such a nature as to preclude the possibility of pardon.

It is reasonable to suppose that the greatness of their sins is among the reasons or conditions of God's purpose to extend saving grace to many in every age. But this cannot give the general rule of his action in the choice of men, for he saves those whose sins are of every degree of magnitude—the least as well as the greatest sinners.

The question, then, remains to be answered: Is there a difference between men in which we can discover a *general rule* in God's dealing with them in the matter of salvation; a difference not in point of repentance, or faith, or merit, or of anything "which can be pleaded as a ground of acceptance with God;" still *something* to which God, dealing with men in a state of gracious probation, can wisely and properly have respect, in deciding to save one man rather than another?

We believe that no adequate rational or Scriptural evidence can be adduced in support of either of these propositions:

1. That the sovereignty of God is a prerogative in the exercise of which he is absolutely free to will the exact opposite of that which he does will in relation to the destiny of every human being.
2. That there is *no difference* between men to which God has respect as among the reasons or conditions of his choice of one man rather than another.
3. That the purpose to pass by—to withhold renewing grace—is, in the logical order, antecedent to and independent of the *actual foresight* of the personal action of those included in that purpose.

The first proposition involves, logically, the denial of the divine benevolence; both the first and second necessarily imply purely arbitrary and capricious action on the part of God in dealing with mankind; while the third requires us to believe, according to the theory of strict Calvinism:

(1) That the perdition of a part of mankind—the non-elect—is not only certain, but *inevitable*, let them do what they can to obtain salvation, even in the way appointed in the gospel.

(2) That God has no compassion for this class and is not dealing with them in good faith.

These propositions are no part of "the gospel of the grace of God," no part of "the good news to *all* people" which Christ and his apostles preached, but metaphysical speculations by which Christian theology has been burdened to its serious injury.

In conclusion we are moved to ask if the words of Chalmers (Institutes of Theology II. 419) are as applicable to our day as they were to his own: "The middle age of science and civilization is now terminated, but Christianity also had its middle age, and this, perhaps, is not yet fully terminated. There is still a remainder of the old spell, even the spell of human authority, and by which a certain cramp or confinement has been laid on the genius of Christianity. We cannot doubt that the time of its complete emancipation is coming, when it shall break loose from the imprisonment in which it is held; but meanwhile there is, as it were, a stricture upon it not yet wholly removed, and in virtue of which the largeness and liberality of heaven's own purposes have been made to descend in partial and scanty droppings through the strainers of an artificial theology, instead of falling, as they ought, in a universal shower upon the world."

And are the cause of this "imprisonment" and the way of "emancipation" indicated in the following words of Dr. Bruce; Kingdom of God 127 (Italics our own): "Has not Christendom been slow to learn the revelation of the Father? Have we not yet to learn it, by accepting the Jesus of the Gospels as an absolutely true and full manifestation of the divine being, and believing without reserve that he and God are in spirit one? *A thoroughly Christian idea of God is still a desideratum, and when the church has reached it, the kingdom of God shall have come in power.*"

Morgan Park, Ill.

CHURCH FOLK-LORE.

BY J. EDWARD VAUX.

From *The Newbury House Magazine* (London), March, 1892.

II.

THE CONGREGATION IN CHURCH.

FROM the number of communications received from all parts of the country, it is evident that the custom of dividing the

sexes, vailed custom, referred to a document the mid ing to t of the d gate of took ch S. Chry day the tions by Church copy th to be in It is r Church north rather to the v the cu larly i gence i try as n and wo

"In of Tha sexes i classes, Church Lady M posite used to

"So respon it was church This w abouts

Nex longin I am t Inn C tomed

A g at Ma shire, or fri family their l the th

At forme but it howev old cu ous de

"The Are

sexes, when worshipping in church, prevailed very widely in rural parishes. This custom is one of great antiquity, as it is referred to in the "Apostolic Constitutions," a document which is certainly not later than the middle of the fourth century. According to the "Constitutions," it was the duty of the deaconesses to attend at the women's gate of the church, while the doorkeepers took charge of that set apart for the men. S. Chrysostom seems to indicate that in his day the churches were divided into two portions by a barrier of wood. In the Eastern Church it was customary for the men to occupy the ground floor, and for the women to be in the porticos or galleries above them. It is uncertain whether in the Western Church the men or the women were on the north side of the nave, but tradition is rather in favour of assigning the north side to the women and the south to the men, as the custom most usually followed. Similarity in principle, accompanied by divergence in practice, has prevailed in this country as regards the relative positions of men and women in church.

"In this part of Essex," wrote the Vicar of Thaxted in 1873, "the separation of the sexes is almost universal among the poorer classes, and I remember at Little Easton Church before its restoration, Lord and Lady Maynard each had a large pew on opposite sides of the church, and they always used to sit each in his or her own pew."

"So far back as 1825," says another correspondent, "how long before I know not, it was the custom to divide the sexes in the church of S. Weonard's, Herefordshire. This was done away with in 1840 or thereabouts."

Next take London. In the chapels belonging to the Inns of Court the sexes have, I am told, always been divided. At Gray's Inn Chapel some of the women were accustomed to sit in a gallery.

A gentleman, writing in 1873, says that at Marston S. Lawrence, in Northamptonshire, the squire and the males of his family or friends have always occupied one large family pew, and his wife and daughters and their lady friends the other. This custom the then squire still retained.

At Christchurch, Birmingham, it was formerly the rule for the sexes to sit apart, but it was abolished in 1860. Traces of it, however, remained until ten years ago. The old custom gave rise to the following humorous doggerel:—

"The Churches and Chapels we usually find,
Are places where men unto women are joined,

But at Christ Church, it seems, they are more
cruel-hearted,
For men and their wives are brought there to be
parted."

Let us go northwards, and we have a former curate of Helmsley, Yorkshire, stating, in 1872, that the division of the sexes was still customary in a district church there, and had been so in the parish church until it was lost when the building was re-seated about five years before. In his letter, he noted also a very curious fact—viz., that he once looked into a dissenting meeting-house near Cambridge, and found that even there the old church custom had been adopted, and that the men and women sat apart.

That the usage was common in Cambridgeshire the following incident will show. On one occasion, the curate of a parish in that county stopped during his sermon, as some one was talking, and said, "I hear a noise." The occupant of a seat on the woman's side of the church said, "Please, sir, it is not us." Curate: "I'm glad to hear it, it will be the sooner over."

The following will recall what was mentioned above as to the rule laid down in the "Apostolic Constitutions."

Formerly it was the custom at Stanton Harcourt Church, Oxfordshire, for the men to enter by the north transept door, but the Vicar has told me that this door was walled up in 1845, when the whole of the church, with the exception of the chancel, was restored by Dr. Harcourt, then Archbishop of York. The north transept door was at a considerable distance from the door into the nave, through which, I presume, the women entered. At S. Mary's, Kidding-ton, in the same county, the north doorway, though blocked, was up to fifty years ago, known as "the bachelors' door."

Again referring to ancient precedent, we find that, as regards the side, whether north or south, on which the men and women respectively were accustomed to sit, it varied in different parishes. Thus at Marks Tey, in Essex, in the middle of the century, it was the custom for all the women, excepting those belonging to the Rector's family, and to those of some of the large farmers, to sit together on the south side of the church, apart from the men. Then at Weston Birt, Gloucestershire, as the Rector has informed me, the men take the south side in the aisle, and the women the north side in the body of the church.

"I remember when I was a boy," writes a gentleman from Abingdon, "a young couple coming into the church here on a Sunday

afternoon and seating themselves together on the women's side. The man was soon turned out of his seat by the verger, with the remark, uttered in an audible voice, 'We don't have no sweethearting here.'"

A less common arrangement of the sexes in church than that mentioned above must be noted.

Mr. F. H. Dickenson has stated that in Somersetshire it is customary for the men to sit in front and the women behind in church. He added that he had seen a regulation, put forth by a Diocesan Synod held at Exeter, ordering this, but that he could not lay his hand upon it.

The like custom prevailed in some churches near Daventry in Northamptonshire in 1846, and perhaps does still. A gentleman, writing in 1873, states that he that year witnessed the same arrangement at Barrington Church, near Cambridge. If necessary I could state other instances. At Bradford-on-Avon the men used to sit in a gallery, called "the country gallery," and the women in the body of the church.

At Durham Cathedral there is a very curious arrangement, which is said to date from time immemorial. Any men who are present in the choir unofficially occupy any of the stalls which happen to be vacant, but women have certain pews set apart for them alone, behind and to the east of the stalls.

I will give one more example of the division of the sexes in church, as it introduces a new feature. Some twenty years ago a former Vicar of Woolavington, near Bridgewater, wrote to a friend as follows:—"I have officiated in churches where the separation of the sexes was very striking, from the men all wearing the rustic costume of a white smock frock, and the women all red cloaks and black bonnets. The nave of the very large church at Saffron Walden was always filled with red cloaks, the wearers each bringing a stool from the bottom of the church for her use, and taking it back again after service."

Let us now go on to inquire about another usage on the part of church-goers—that of bowing to the altar on entering or leaving church. Of late years this has, to a great extent, fallen into disuse, at least among working-folk, but it was common during the last century.

A writer of a hundred and fifty years ago makes a bitter moan because he saw that in one of the greatest of the cathedrals in this country, the reader going to the lectern "made a sort of obeisance to the altar, but instantly whirling about made another at

least as profound reverence to the stalls." His complaint was that the same reverence was shown to the dignitaries as was shown to God. "Shall [said he] *Viri ecclesiastici*, as some of them plainly do, refuse to pay this reverence, *Domino Deo, et Altare Ejus*, and yet sacrilegiously assume it to themselves? Is this our zeal against Popery? to affect the very badge of anti-Christ, who, as God, sitteth in the temple of God."

A later correspondent to the same periodical, and one who held quite different opinions, scoffs at what he called "altar worship," speaking of it as an "ill custom at cathedrals."

This "ill custom" is still continued at some of our cathedral churches. A friend tells me that at Carlisle, when the bishop is present at a service, the canons conduct him to the throne, and the bishop, before going to his seat, bows first to the altar and then to the members of the chapter.

As to the habit of members of the Universities making a reverence to the altar in their college chapels, a few examples must be given. Thus at Christ Church, Oxford, the dean and canons used to stop at the chancel door as they left the chapel, turn round to the east, and bow. And similarly at Balliol, which in our day is certainly not distinguished by any exceptional regard for Church traditions.

A correspondent writing some years ago stated that his father, who was elected a fellow of Balliol in 1784, had told him that Dr. Leigh, who had been Master of the college about half a century, always bowed to the altar, both on entering and leaving chapel.

The like custom might have been seen practised at Cambridge in the earlier part of this century. Old inhabitants of the town can remember that, amongst others, Dr. Wood, who was Master of St. John's from 1815 to 1839, always on entering and leaving the chapel used to turn round and bow to the altar.

Coming down to our own time, a clergyman in the north of England has told me that an old woman who lived in his parish always used to make a courtesy to the altar before going to her seat in church. On referring to her custom one day, she replied: "Lord bless you, parson, if my father had seen that we did not make our reverence, he'd a' been vexed for a week." This old woman, as well as others, always bowed low at the *Gloria*. The practice of bowing, my informant says, he himself learnt from the people of Laxey, in the Isle of Man, where he had his first curacy in 1849.

Bow sense, where out. ham, V the me forehe inform the cus to do."

It m the cu mostly in vill that t Archde always Morche that he the Re

In a on ent by a fo that t coming plucki courte

A fr subject the Al mon P the fol

"As s receivi Comm ards th

It is has th himsel ing up

"N —I off the bo shire, altar

young of Lo myself remon

gave n was m creatu

is viv neigh anecd was o Conso buff."

The to hav hundr

Bowing, taking the word in its strict sense, was not the usage in some places where the principle involved was carried out. A clergyman tells me that at Addingham, Wharfedale, where he was brought up, the men used to strike their "toppings" or foreheads, as they came into church. My informant was told, when he asked about the custom, that "it was the proper thing to do."

It may be thought that in country places the custom which we are considering was mostly confined to ignorant working people in villages. This is a mistake, for I find that the Ven. J. Bartholomew, who was Archdeacon of Barnstaple, and died in 1866, always bowed to the altar in his church at Morchard Bishop, North Devon. He said that he had learnt the habit from his father, the Rev. Robert Bartholomew.

In addition to the customary "reverence" on entering and leaving church, I am told by a former curate of a parish in Yorkshire, that the communicants on going to and coming from the altar always either bowed, plucking their forelocks, or dropped a courtesy.

A friend tells me, in writing about this subject, that he possesses a "Companion to the Altar," bound up with a Book of Common Prayer, and dated 1770, which contains the following direction for communicants:—"As soon as you conveniently may, after receiving the Cup, if there be a numerous Communion, rise from your knees, bow towards the altar, and return to your seat."

It is always gratifying to find a man who has the sense to tell a good story against himself. A clergyman has put the following upon record:—

"Nearly forty years ago—i.e., about 1850—I officiated amongst a simple people on the borders of Worcestershire and Herefordshire, where the practice of bowing to the altar was not uncommon; but to me, a young clergyman, from the neighborhood of London, it was novel, and I imagined myself to be the object of reverence. I remonstrated with an aged parishioner, who gave me to understand that the reverence was made to the Almighty, not to a fellow-creature. Her decided manner at the time is vividly impressed upon my mind. A neighbour to whom I recently related the anecdote, remarked that the same mistake was once made by H.R.H. the late Prince Consort, and that it met with a similar rebuff."

The custom of bowing to the altar seems to have been taken for granted a couple of hundred years ago. In a pamphlet written

in 1700, and entitled, "Mrs. Abigail; or, a Female Skirmish between the Wife of a Country Squire and the Wife of a D.D.," we have the following: Speaking of the subserviency of the poorer clergy to those who were at that time of higher social rank, we read:—"This little Sir John (the chaplain) always very mannerly arose at the serving of the second course, and *with a bow as low as to the Altar*, took with him the plate he had ate on, &c. &c." It should be noted that the pamphlet was very far from being a High Church publication.

Everybody is in the habit of saying, or appearing to say, some sort of brief prayer upon taking his place in church. I am told that formerly an old man in a parish in Yorkshire used to say his preparatory prayer facing round in turn to each corner of his pew. Is it possible that this queer usage was somehow connected with the old familiar formula:

"Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John,
Bless the bed that I lie on.
Four corners to my bed,
Four Angels round me spread,
Two at foot, and two at head,
And four to carry me when I'm dead."

Let us go a step further; we all know that outward expressions of reverence to inanimate representations of sacred things are by many in our own day regarded as alien to the spirit of the Church of England. In relation to this I give an extract from a treatise against Popery by Archbishop Wake, who, previous to his advancement to the Episcopate, had been chaplain to William of Orange. It ran thus:

"When the pictures of God the Father, and of God the Holy Ghost, so directly contrary to the Second Commandment, and to S. Paul's doctrine, shall be taken away, and those of our Saviour and the blessed Saints be, with all necessary cautions, rendered truly the books, not the snares of the ignorant, then will we respect the images of our Saviour and the Blessed Virgin. And as some of us now bow down toward the Altar, and all of us are enjoined to do so at the name of our Lord Jesus, so will we not fail to testify all due respect to His representation."

Another reverential usage, which appears to have been widely spread in former days, was that of giving an outward expression of homage when the verse in the *Venite*, "O come let us worship and fall down, &c.," was recited. It was formerly the custom for the Dean and Canons of Durham to kneel down in their stalls when these words were sung. Dean Cornwallis, Dr. Durell, and Dr. Prosser used to do this. Their immediate successors only bowed, and then the custom disappeared entirely. At S. John's,

Edinburgh, about 1846, the whole congregation knelt at the words cited above, and the well-known chant, Purcell in G, was changed into a minor key for that verse only.

There are several other parts in the Church Service where outward tokens of reverence were wont to be rendered by the congregation in olden times. For example, a lady at Swansea has told me that at S. Mary's Church, Brecknock, bowing at the *Gloria* was formerly the common custom of the older and poorer members of the congregation. Also, that at the thrice repeated "Holy" in the *Te Deum*, the old women used to courtesy three times. This, adds my informant, was continued till within the last thirty years. Similarly, at Ampney Crucis, in Gloucestershire, the old women, twenty years ago, courtesied at the *Gloria*, and at every mention of the names of the Three Persons in the Blessed Trinity. At S. Leonard's, Shoreditch, it was the custom till quite lately for most of the old people to bow at the words "Thou art the King of Glory, O Christ," in the *Te Deum*. I trust that this is continued, but I have no information.

A correspondent, whose name I have unfortunately mislaid, wrote to me in 1880 to say that when he was at Cuddesdon, the present Bishop of Lincoln, who was chaplain and assistant lecturer there from 1858 to 1863, told him that at Stone, Dartford, Kent (so far as my correspondent's memory served him as to the name of the village), it was customary when Psalm cl. occurred in the service, for the whole of the congregation to say it together.

A few words must be said about turning to the east at the Creeds. I was told by the late Canon Humble that, in his younger days, all the congregations in the City of Durham observed this practice, and that he believed it was general throughout the county. In the city it was more noticeable from the dreadful way in which most of the churches were seated. The pews to the east of the desk and pulpit were arranged so that the people might face the reader or preacher. Thus the occupants had to turn right round. At Grewell, near Odiham, Hampshire, before the church was altered, there was a men's gallery at the eastern end of the nave, facing westward, and the same custom prevailed. At Alton, Hants, members of the congregation, whose seats faced westwards, turned to the east at the Gospel as well as at the Creed. Mr. F. J. Ames, the postmaster at Crondall, tells me that this was discontinued in 1859. Probably

the church was re-seated in that year, and the whole congregation faced east.

Everybody must have noticed that in our churches now almost all present bow when the Holy Name is mentioned in the Creed, but only a few persons make a "reverence" when it occurs in the Hymns or Lessons. Bearing upon this, a well-known clerical author says that in Cumberland it is the custom for every one to bow at the Holy Name at funerals, at baptisms, and at the Holy Communion when receiving, though they may not do it at any other time.

The custom of bowing at the *Gloria*, mentioned above, seems to have been very commonly observed in past days, and the "reverence" usually took place when the word "Son" was pronounced. In relation to this custom the Vicar of Thaxted has drawn my attention to a book which enjoyed very considerable popularity at the beginning of the last century. It was entitled "Devotions in the ancient way of Offices, reformed by a Person of Quality." The name of Geo. Hickes, D.D., appears on the title-page as editor or sponsor, I presume, and in 1712 it had reached a fourth edition. After a direction to say the Psalms standing, it proceeds:

"At the end of every Psalm let A. say 'Glory, &c.' and B. 'As it was, &c.' both continuing to stand, and showing some other sign of worship by bowing the head, or lifting up the eyes to heaven. For in all devotion the exterior worship is never to be neglected, and those stiff, morose, and saturnine votists who are so sparing of bodily adoration in our most solemn services, refusing to stand at the singing of Psalms and Anthems, or to bow to God before His holy altars, act against the common notions of mankind, and the nature of Divine service."

In some places it was the custom for the congregation to turn to the east at the *Gloria*. This was the case at the old church in Manchester, now the Cathedral, and I believe that it is still retained. At Talaton Church, near Ottery S. Mary, Devon, it was formerly the custom for the people in church to turn to the west when the singing began, but to turn to the east at the Doxologies. This usage was dropped through the influence of a churchwarden, who, in a late Rector's time, attempted to put a stop to the custom of turning to the west. This was in 1857 or 1858. But his well-meant action resulted in the people turning to the west as before, but not turning to the east at the Doxologies. Since that date the Church has been repaired, the gallery removed, and the fiddles and the flutes abolished. The organ is at the west end of the church, but nevertheless the people are

graduated to it.

It is day for Lord's In the near 'ple to usage Cathed nonjuri has to when (tural C tion, w sons. were re stand,

Ano noted, and it served kneel s This, I former Crond year 18

In a custom the cle the ves an anc at Hol that it gregat clergy stated the pe preceded

Akin it was Abing ever t the ch The Refor the Ed very la of St obeisan They the fol Cirenc Wedne bers of ing th on aga in the one at

Let

gradually leaving off the custom of turning to it.

It is by no means uncommon in our own day for congregations to stand up when the Lord's Prayer occurs in the Second Lesson. In the old parish church of Begborough, near Taunton, it was the habit of the people to kneel on such an occasion. This usage was formerly observed in Exeter Cathedral. In Scotland, in churches of the nonjuring type, as the late Canon Humble has told me, the people were wont to rise when (a) the Lord's Prayer, (b) the Scriptural Canticles, and (c) the Angelic Salutation, were read in the course of the Lessons. Also when the Ten Commandments were read in the Lesson the people used to stand, and perhaps do so still.

Another out-of-the-way custom may be noted, but I have only two examples of it, and it was probably not very commonly observed. This was for the congregation to kneel at the "Ascription" after the sermon. This, I am told, was the case at Hexham in former days, and the custom prevailed at Crondall Church, Hants, until about the year 1861.

In all well-ordered churches it is now the custom for the congregation to stand when the clergy and choir come to the stalls from the vestry. This is doubtless the revival of an ancient custom, for a clergyman who was at Hoby Leicestershire in 1843, has told me that it was then the custom for all the congregation to stand when the officiating clergymen entered the church. He further stated that at Marks Tey, in Essex, in 1833, the people always waited for the Rector to precede them in going out of church.

Akin to this I understand that formerly it was the custom at St. Helen's Church, Abingdon, for the congregation to rise whenever the Mayor and Corporation attended the church in their official capacity.

The following note has a thoroughly pre-Reformation flavour. A correspondent of the *Ecclesiologist* in 1841 states that, until very lately, it was the custom for the people of Strington, in Somersetshire, to do obeisance to the churchyard cross.

There is, or was, until twenty years ago, the following odd usage at Ampney Crucis, Cirencester. At the club feast on the Wednesday in Whitsun week, all the members of the club took off their hats on entering the churchyard, and did not put them on again after service until they were again in the road. This was never done by any one at any other time.

Let us now go on to consider the question

of daily prayers in our churches in olden times. There can be no doubt as to the intention of the Church of England in regard to this matter. The words "The Order of Morning and Evening Prayer daily to be said and used throughout the year," cannot mean that it is to be said and used on Sundays only. Nevertheless, except in cathedrals and college chapels, I think it would be difficult to name a church in which the rule had been strictly observed since our present Book of Common Prayer was taken into general use in 1662 after the last revision. If any one can give a trustworthy instance of such observance I shall thankfully acknowledge my error.

It is not a little curious to examine the published Charges and Pastoral Letters issued by the Bishops in the past. The reproofs and suggestions contained in them give us a tolerably fair notion of the condition of church matters in olden times. Amongst other things, they show how churchmanship varied in different dioceses. Thus, by way of instance, we have "A Discourse to his Clergy" by Bishop Sprat, of Rochester, in 1695, wherein the recitation of daily service is taken for granted. On the other hand, Bishop Turner, of Ely, in 1686, told his clergy:

"There is one thing more which I do exceedingly long to see introduced, and would fain obtain that which the Rubric, in the true intent of it, still exacts of you—to have Morning and Evening Prayer every day of the week in your church, if you live upon your cure, or keep a curate upon it, and not extreme far from the church. And if by any means in the world you can prevail with at least a few of your parishioners, which sure cannot be wanting in most parishes, where there are some devout gentry or persons of quality, or at least some piously disposed people; and to all such I could almost kneel most earnestly, begging of them, as they love God, and their own and other Christian souls, that they will do their part towards the promoting of so good a work, perhaps the best and the most public good they can ever do in the places where they live, and where there are either poor widows, who may well afford to be at prayers for those whose pensioners they are; or where there are any children taught by a schoolmaster or mistress, there it is very hard if some little congregation might not be found, would but the minister attempt and labour it with as much application and zeal as the thing mightily deserves. Nay, better the minister, with or without his parish clerk, and with but some of his own family, that he may say, 'When two or three are gathered together in Thy name,' than not to begin this worthy design of prayers twice a day in your churches; but where that cannot be for the distance of your houses, there to have them without fail in your private families."

I have given this extract at length, because, if read between the lines, it supplies some sketchy notion of the state of our par-

ishes at the end of the seventeenth century ; and chiefly because it gives expression to the thoroughly religious sentiments of one of those noble Bishops who refused to take the oath of allegiance to William and Mary, and suffered deprivation and poverty rather than do violence to their consciences.

Bishop Turner's earnest expostulation does not seem to have had much effect, for a very few years later we find his successor, Bishop Patrick, again speaking seriously to the clergy in the diocese of Ely in reference to the same subject.

In a very large number of the Bishops' Charges we find the obligation of the clergy to have daily service conveniently shirked. There is a great deal about preaching and catechising, and carefulness in reading the service ; but the duty of affording to the people opportunities for daily public worship only occasionally finds a place in these addresses. It is tolerably evident that their Lordships found it impracticable to enforce it, even if they desired to have the practice observed.

And while speaking of Bishop's Charges, and of what they omitted to speak about, I cannot, in passing, refrain from mentioning a topic upon which one Church dignitary warmly enlarged. This was Archbishop Hort, of Tuam, who at his primary visitation, in 1742, suggested, in sufficiently plain language, that it was the duty of every clergyman who had not an estate, independent of his clerical income, to provide that his widow should not be driven to some "charity house," or his daughters left at the mercy of profligates for the sake of a subsistence. Would it not have been much better if his Grace had told the younger clergy that, unless they had sufficient private incomes to justify such a step, they had no right, morally, to marry ? I wish that our present Bishops would be straightforward enough to speak out plainly upon this most important and common-sense matter.

But as to the daily service, it was the High Church clergy who argued in its favour. While Richard Baxter considered that it was something more than a waste of time, men like Sancroft, Beveridge, and Nelson, were strongly in favour of its importance. Most cultured people know that there was a strong High Church reaction in Queen Anne's reign, and a very remarkable expression of enthusiasm in favour of High Church principles was manifested. I do not know anything more striking in post-Reformation Church History than the record of week-day services, which Paterson

has handed down to us in his "Pietas Londinensis." Of course, in reading such a list of City services as he gives, we must make allowance for the change of circumstances which has taken place. With the exception of caretakers, there are very few residents in the City now. But enthusiasm, however excellent in starting a work, is but a very weak staff to trust to as regards its continuance. As a matter of fact, the popular feeling in favour of daily services very soon died out, and before the middle of the last century, supposing that we had any accredited record, the list would show a very sad falling off when contrasted with that given by Paterson. Then again, London is not the only place in the world ; to gauge the religious condition of a nation we must go into the smaller towns and villages. This test will prove more true, because in such places religious sentiment will be likely to be more real, and less a matter of excitement, example, and fashion. Then, whichever way we look at it, there was everything against the practice of daily service. It was, as it is now, a mark of respectability to attend church on Sundays ; but worship on week-days subjected religious people to the charge of trying to make themselves out better than their neighbours ; add to which, the gradual change in social habits, and in business habits, both of which militated strongly against the daily prayers.

Wednesday and Friday services remained popular for some time after the daily services had been given up. Archbishop Secker, in a charge delivered by him in 1761, said that there should always be prayers on those days, and John Wesley expressed the same opinion. This practice, however, gradually dwindled down.

We cannot wonder that the lay folk had no very great regard for prayers alone, when so many of the clergy themselves considered their recitation as suited only for assistant curates, and quite below the dignity of rectors and other such exalted personages. Let any one try to imagine how things must have been when it was necessary for a Bishop of Rochester at the end of the seventeenth century to say : "The devout and decent reading of the Holy Offices of the Church is so far from being a perfunctory and superficial work, a mean and vulgar accomplishment, or a subordinate lower administration, only fit for a curate, &c. &c."

A few words must be added about congregational singing.

It is difficult to know exactly what was

meant
the las
whethe
"Tate
two m
into us
for mo
a fact,
tion of
idea of
Tate a
it was
someth
secured
countr
two ve
it may
eral st
Psalm
Psalte
speake
falseh
forth
apply
Thus

Its te
direct
what
tion.

And
congr
devoti
Bisho
his cl
cially
clerks
went
ple of
bility
menti
recen
heard
one b
Let a
drew
agina
I am
that
Lond
nity
the d
In
and
woul
know
tions
life,"

meant by the term which was common in the last century, "The Singing Psalms," whether "Sternhold and Hopkins" or "Tate and Brady." The former of these two metrical versions seems to have come into use about 1562, and to have continued for more than 200 years. I believe it to be a fact, that even so late as 1828 a new edition of this version was published with the idea of its being used in church. That by Tate and Brady was issued about 1698; but it was far from popular at first, and it took something like a hundred years before it secured anything like a foothold in this country. To the present generation the two versions are equally unknown, so that it may be worth while to indicate the general style of the "New Version." Take Psalm xli. v. 6. It runs thus in the Psalter: "And if he come to see me he speaketh vanity, and his heart conceiveth falsehood within itself, and when he cometh forth he telleth it." This was made to apply to the scandal talked at morning calls. Thus:

"Suppose they formal visits make,
It's all but empty show;
They gather mischief in their hearts,
And vent it where they go."

Its teaching was, of course, delightfully direct, but whether it quite represented what the Psalmist meant is another question.

And as to the best means of encouraging congregational singing, and consequently a devotional tone given to the service, the Bishop of London, about 150 years ago, told his clergy that, in country parishes especially, they should instruct their parish clerks to read the Psalm line by line as they went on. It will be difficult for young people of the present day to imagine the possibility of such a barbarous custom as that mentioned, yet it lasted till a comparatively recent date. I remember having, as a boy, heard the lines of Tate and Brady read out one by one, and thinking the effect comical. Let an ordinary worshipper, say at St. Andrew's, Wells Street, throw himself, in imagination, back into the past days of which I am speaking, and he would scarcely think that the plan proposed by the Bishop of London was calculated to advance the dignity of Church worship or to conduce to the devotion of the people.

In these days we laugh at the idea of Tate and Brady being sung in church; but it would be well to remember that the well-known hymn to be found in most collections, "Through all the changing scenes of life," is simply their rendering of Psalm

xxxiv. The familiar "O God of Hosts, the mighty Lord," is only a rhyming version of Psalm lxxxiv., and is also the work of Tate and Brady.

If, with our present habits and experience, we could, in imagination, join an olden-time church congregation, we should find not a little to surprise and shock us. Before Charles I.'s reign it was very much the custom for men to wear their hats in church. Again and again, in the *Spectator*, Addison condemned the irreverent habits of people who went to church in his day. Thus, if a stranger came to a church to preach, it seems to have been a common thing for the members of the congregation to make gestures to one another, if there happened to be anything peculiar about his intonation or style, while the ladies would giggle behind their fans. Or again, we have a description of the demeanour of a friend of "Will Honeycomb": "Heseldom comes in till prayers are about half over, and when he has entered his seat, instead of joining with the congregation, he devoutly holds his hat before his face for three or four moments, then bows to all his acquaintance, sits down, takes a pinch of snuff, and spends the remaining time in surveying the congregation." In the *Examiner* and the *Guardian* similar criticisms may be found. The following passage from the Sixth Satire in Young's "Love of Fame," published about the middle of the last century, illustrates this, while recalling the delightful pictures of character which William Law had given some twenty years before in his "Serious Call":

"Lavinia is polite, but not profane,
To church as constant as to Drury Lane.
She decently in form pays Heaven its due,
And makes a civil visit to her pew.
Her lifted fan, to give a solemn air,
Conceals her face, which passes for a prayer.
Curtisies to curtisies then with grace succeed,
Not one the fair omits, but at the Creed."

The satire contained in the last line must not be missed.

WHEN IS THE POPE INFALLIBLE?

BY THE VERY REV. MGR. JOSEPH SCHROEDER, D.D., PH.D., PROFESSOR OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY IN THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA.

From *The Independent* (Undenomin.), New York, March 10, 1892.

ACCORDING to the Catholic doctrine, Jesus Christ has instituted in his Church

an apostolic succession, a teaching body, invested with the mission of announcing to all peoples the revealed truth, and speaking to the faithful with a divine authority, based on the formal promise of the special protection of the Divine Saviour and the assistance of the Holy Spirit of Truth. This protection of Christ, assured to his Apostles "until the consummation of the ages," this assistance of the Spirit of Truth, who was to remain with them "until the end," guaranteed to the teaching authority the gift of infallibility in the exercise of its mission, and imposes upon the faithful what St. Paul calls, in his energetic language, "the obedience of faith."

There exists, then, in the Church of Jesus Christ a living, perpetual and infallible authority, constituted, according to the will of Christ, by the successors of Peter and of the other Apostles—the Pope and the Bishops of the Catholic Church. The Pope and the Episcopate united to him, whether they be assembled in a council or not, are the *subjects* of the infallibility of the Church; they form the *Ecclesia Docens*. This doctrine is the fundamental one in the controversy between Catholics and Protestants.

The question proposed at the Council of the Vatican was this: Has Jesus Christ, in building his Church upon Peter, in giving him the charge of confirming his brothers in the faith, and in charging him to feed his lambs and his sheep, thereby promised infallibility to Peter himself and his successors? In other words. Is the Pope, by himself alone, also the subject of infallibility? Has it been promised to him in the person of St. Peter, the first Pope?

The Council answered in the affirmative by defining that "the Pope, defining ex cathedra, enjoys the same infallibility as that with which Christ has been pleased to invest his Church."

This definition contains in germ the explanation of the exalted prerogative in question. For from it the following conclusions necessarily flow:

1. There is no essential difference between a definition emanating from the Pope alone, and the definition of a General Council (which cannot be such without union with the Pope); that is to say, the value of the act of the judicial sentence is the same, and the teaching authority is the same in the two cases, and, consequently, Catholics are obliged to submit themselves to them equally. The difference can only be accidental; a doctrinal decision emanating from the united magisterium of the Pope and

the bishops has naturally more solemnity and more *éclat*, as well in itself as in its effect.

2. The *intrinsic cause* of the infallibility of the Pope is the same as for that of the entire Teaching Church. The Catholic doctrine has always taught that the definitions of the Church are not based on *new divine revelations*; on the contrary, it is a dogma that the "Catholic revelation," that is to say, the revelation of truths of faith to be believed by every Catholic as revealed by God, was completed by the Holy Ghost in the Apostles, and that there will not be an objective increment of the deposit of faith in the present economy, but only a subjective increment; *i.e.*, a more perfect knowledge of the doctrine once revealed, by its more explicit explanation and proposition.

It will be understood from this in what sense the Catholic can speak of the history of dogmas; *i.e.*, the history of the explication of dogmas.

This shows also the essential difference which there is between revelation, properly so-called, and revelations called *private*, made by God to one or several persons. Whoever admits the existence of the supernatural order should recognize the possibility of these private revelations; the one who receives, or believes himself to receive, divine revelations will be equally bound to believe their contents; but these private revelations as such can never become a part of the *depositum fidei*, and consequently cannot be an object of "Catholic faith."

Infallibility, accordingly, is not a gift communicated by infusion; it gives neither to the bishops of a council nor to a Pope an infused knowledge. The gift of infallibility consists only in this: that the Holy Spirit assists the Teaching Church and prevents it from falling into error. So, in the words of the Council, the Pope is infallible, "by the *divine assistance* which has been promised to him in the person of blessed St. Peter."

3. The Pope has, like the entire Teaching Church, the charge of "guarding the deposit of faith." This deposit is contained in Holy Scripture and in tradition. He is, then, like the Council, infallible *only* when there is question of preserving this deposit in all its integrity, of explaining its true sense, and of defending it against errors. Hence, it is said, that Holy Scripture and tradition are for every Catholic the *remote rule of faith*. The Church proposes infallibly the truths contained in them, as the unity of the faith may require. These truths proposed by the Church as revealed

truths bound faith (A)

Further she makes or facts The in Pope re which, ever, co been ex not yet from th mitted gians, s falling a sin ap truths propose which i ate div

This authentic together ble prop of the f to his immed

4. The Pope is of the words, Its obje the Po defend intact b the Vat that th a doctri held by

5. F follows not cor that th pend u bishops fine a deposit ly, but to mak nary ex taining a part the cor has def must th he mak of the cil defi Popes a

truths are called *dogmas*, and Catholics are bound to believe all of them with divine faith (*fide divina*).

Furthermore, the Church guards and defends the deposit of faith infallibly when she makes a definite judgment on doctrines or facts closely connected with revelation. The infallibility of the Church or of the Pope relatively to these last truths or facts which, without being revealed, are, however, connected with revelation, has never been explicitly *defined*, and is, therefore, not yet a dogma; but it follows logically from the dogma, and is consequently admitted by the consensus of Catholic theologians, so that one cannot deny it without falling into grievous error and committing a sin against faith. The Catholic believes truths thus defined, not as revealed, but as proposed by an authority the infallibility of which is revealed (*fide ecclesiastica* or *mediate divina*).

This proposition of religious truths, made authentically by all the Teaching Church together, or by the Pope alone, is an infallible proposition. In virtue of the assistance of the Holy Spirit promised by Jesus Christ to his Church, and it is the *proximate* or *immediate* rule of faith.

4. The end of the infallibility of the Pope is the same as that of the infallibility of the Teaching Church; it is, in a few words, the unity of the Church in the faith. Its *object* is the divine deposit, inasmuch as the Pope is its guardian, interpreter and defender, in order that it may be preserved intact by all the faithful. The Council of the Vatican determines this object by saying that the Pope is infallible "when he defines a doctrine relating to faith or morals to be held by all the faithful."

5. From the foregoing considerations it follows that the infallibility of the Pope is not communicated to him by the Church, that the value of his decision does not depend upon the assent accorded to it by the bishops or the faithful. He will never define a truth which is not contained in the deposit of faith either explicitly or implicitly, but no one in the Church has the right to make his assent depend upon a preliminary examination for the purpose of ascertaining that the doctrine in question is really a part of revelation. The Catholic must, on the contrary, reason as follows: The Pope has defined such a doctrine as revealed; I must then believe it to be revealed, because he makes the definition with the assistance of the Holy Spirit. In this sense the Council defined that "these judgments of the Popes are in themselves, and not from the

consent of the Church, irreformable." In the same sense it is true also that this infallibility is a personal gift; that is to say, the person of the Pope is its subject. It is proper to him, not inasmuch as he is a private person, but inasmuch as he is a public person, because he is the foundation stone of the Church, the confirmer of his brethren, the shepherd of all the sheep, the doctor of all Christians; in a word, because he is the head of the Church. That is why the Council adds that the Pope is infallible when he defines, "in his capacity of pastor and doctor of all Christians, in virtue of his supreme apostolic authority."

It is evident that the Pope in his governmental and administrative measures as temporal sovereign of the Pontifical States never was and never will be any more infallible than other secular princes.

So, too, his infallibility does not extend to his acts of ecclesiastical administration, such as excommunication, the erection of dioceses, the appointment of bishops, and the abolishing or suspending of religious orders.

6. When, therefore, it is certain that a Papal definition is *ex cathedrâ*, it is equally certain for every Catholic that this definition is infallible, by the assistance of the Holy Spirit, and that it ought to receive the assent of faith. Certainly the Pope, before making a decision, will investigate, consult theological sources, in order to know the revelation better, as a General Council also does; but the infallibility of his judgment is in no way based on these investigations. I do not believe it because the Pope is a great theologian, because he has surrounded himself by the lights of other theologians or of bishops; the formal reason, the *ultimate motive* of my faith is solely the assistance of the Holy Spirit. It is this that renders our faith "a reasonable service." Consequently, as soon as an *ex cathedrâ* definition presents itself, I make an act of faith, saying: "I believe, because the Pope defines this doctrine, and because the Pope in defining it is protected against all error by the Holy Spirit who assists him." From the very fact of the definition given follows the obligation of the faithful to submit to it; no one can require as a condition of his submission a knowledge of the human means by which the Pope or the Council have availed themselves before giving the definition of faith.

7. In order to be obliged to submit themselves to a judgment of a Pope *ex cathedrâ*, Catholics must know with certainty that there is question of a doctrine that all must

hold, and that it is proposed in virtue of an infallible authority; in other words, that the Pope has the intention of exercising his supreme authority of Doctor of the Faithful, by such a decree. This criterion is contained in the definition of the Council. It is notified to the faithful that the Pope teaches in virtue of his supreme and infallible authority, when he teaches as a public person, as pastor and doctor of all the faithful and when he teaches a doctrine which is to be held by all. The Pope may say it explicitly, but this is not necessary, for he can also indicate it by the very manner in which he exercises his authority. But it is certain that he must indicate in some way or another his intention to make a definition. Thus the formulæ: "If any one say . . . let him be anathema," or "we define," or the declaration that such or such a doctrine is "heretical," or even "erroneous," "false," leading to "heresy," etc., indicate clearly in the decrees of councils or of Popes the intention of exercising the infallible magisterium.

The following examples may be cited of Papal utterances during the last hundred years which are considered as undoubtedly infallible definitions *ex cathedrâ*: The constitution "*Auctorem Fidei*" (August 28th, 1794), in which Pius VI condemned the doctrine of the Synod of Pistoia, declaring some propositions heretical, and qualifying others as false, temerarious, etc., indicating clearly that all Catholics are forbidden "to think or judge of these positions otherwise;" the encyclical "*Mirari Vos*," of August 15th, 1832, in which Gregory XVI condemned indifferentism; the bull "*Ineffabilis*" (December 8th, 1854), by which Pius IX defined the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, and the encyclical "*Quanta Cura*" (December 8th, 1864), against modern "Naturalism." In regard to the Syllabus, which forms an appendix to the last-named encyclical, and which is only a *résumé* of modern errors already censured in other Pontifical documents, it can certainly be said that the mode of publication (it was sent to the bishops by order of the Pope by Cardinal Antonelli), does not characterize it as an utterance *ex cathedrâ*; but its dogmatic value is incontestable, in view of its contents and the circumstances of its publication; so much the more that it has received the explicit adhesion of the entire Episcopate.

8. Two questions present themselves here: (a) Must the teaching of the Pope be addressed immediately to the whole

Church, in order to be *ex cathedrâ*? Is this a condition *sine quâ non*? (b) Do all documents addressed to the whole Church, notably the encyclical letters, become, by that very fact, definitions *ex cathedrâ*?

(a) The answer to the first question can be only a matter of theological opinion. We consider it more probable that a doctrinal decree may be addressed immediately to a part of the Church, and even to one particular bishop, and yet at the same time be *ex cathedrâ*, if the nature of the decree itself indicates that it is directed immediately and virtually to the entire Church; in other words, if the Pope proposes in it a doctrine which must be held by all. It goes without saying that the other faithful must know authentically that it is a definition of the Pope, in order to be obliged to believe in it; but in this case no other definition on the point is necessary.

By way of example may be cited the decision of Innocent I, in the affair of the Pelagians; this was sent only to the African bishops, but yet St. Augustine declared the matter ended—"Roma locuta, causa finita." Similarly the dogmatic letter of Leo I to Flavian, in the year 449, sent by the Pope in order to put an end to the controversy at Constantinople; the profession of faith sent by Hormisdas to the bishops of the Orient; and the condemnation of the errors of Bajus, addressed to the University of Louvain, by Pius V, in 1567.

(b) To the second question we answer: No, it cannot be said that all the teachings of popes addressed to the whole Church are definitions *ex cathedrâ*. In order to understand well this affirmation, and not to draw from it inexact and false conclusions, it is absolutely necessary to have before one's eyes the following distinctions:

1. The Church is a society, a perfect society, a visible society. Its unity is unity in the faith, and also a social unity. The Pope is both the center and the principle of unity. He is the principle of unity in the faith; all Catholics owe the obedience of *faith* to all his doctrinal decisions. But he is at the same time the pastor and supreme ruler of the Church; he has full and entire jurisdiction over all its members, and all owe a true obedience to his orders and his directions. This last obedience does not consist in an act of faith, but it is based on the faith which teaches us that the sovereignty of the Church is confided by Jesus Christ to the Pope, and that all owe to its sovereignty a *filial submission*. The Pope can then speak to the whole Church as its

supreme prerogative.

2. Every act is not, and, consequently, to which faith; it acts as such. Thus the definitions are in ecclesiastical. But the his infallible definitions are when the firmation of authority exercises intensification value of must not gaging trine the decrees of the Pope and Ca sum re the obedi of the Church.

The Church preme to wor the jub privileg tices of

It fo Pope c constit Church suprem Church ex cath to him his view word o norm should

We of the a defin distinguishing teaching doctrin bility e

Leo of the teaching norma when

supreme ruler without making use of his prerogative of infallible teacher.

2. Every act of the pontifical magisterium is not, therefore, a definition *ex cathedra*, and, consequently, an infallible judgment, to which the Catholic owes the assent of faith; the supreme teacher does not always act as the defining and infallible teacher. Thus the decrees of the Roman congregations are called "decrees of the Holy See," in ecclesiastical parlance, and with reason. But the Pope cannot communicate to others his infallibility; the decrees of congregations are not infallible definitions, not even when the Pope confirms them. This confirmation is certainly that of the supreme authority of the Church, but it is not the exercise of this supreme authority in all its intensity. For such a decree to have the value of a decision *ex cathedra*, the Pope must make it his, and indicate in promulgating it, his intention of defining a doctrine that all the Church must hold. The decrees of the congregations confirmed by the Pope have certainly a great authority, and Catholics owe obedience to them (*assensus religiosum*); but this obedience is not the obedience of faith due to the definitions of the Church or of the Pope.

The Pope is equally the high priest of the Church; it is to him that belongs the supreme power of regulating all that relates to worship. It is thus that he announces the jubilee, that he accords indulgences as privileges, that he prescribes common practices of piety, certain prayers, etc.

It follows from what precedes that the Pope can address himself in his encyclicals, constitutions, letters, etc., to the entire Church in his capacity of supreme teacher, supreme ruler, or supreme priest of the Church, without giving in them definitions *ex cathedra*. In any case the Catholic owes to him perfect obedience; he must regulate his views and his actions according to the word of the Pope, that is for all really "the norm to which their minds and actions should conform."

We will add, finally, that in a document of the Pope or of a Council which contains a definition *ex cathedra*, it is necessary to distinguish between this and the other teachings, expositions and developments of doctrine which are found in it. The infallibility extends only to the definition.

Leo XIII speaks as the supreme teacher of the Church when he "provides for the teaching of philosophy" "*ad fidei catholicæ normam*" (encyclical "*Æterni Patris*"), when he "presents the Catholic doctrine,

gives salutary admonitions in the struggle against socialism" (encyclical "*Quod Apostolici Muneris*"), when he "unveils the dangers of secret societies" (encyclical "*Humanum Genus*"), when he "teaches what the Church prescribes in regard to the constitution and the direction of States" (encyclical "*Immortale Dei*"). He exercises his power of supreme ruler of the Church when he vindicates the liberty of the Holy See (allocution "*Post Excitatos*," epistle "*Quantumque*," etc.), when he indicates the rules to be followed in the choice of bishops (Constitution "*Immortalis*"), and when he defends the religious orders (epistle "*Perlecta a Nobis*"). He shows his solicitude as supreme priest in recommending and prescribing the recitation of the rosary (encyclical "*Supremi Apostolatus*"), and in according new privileges to the Third Order of St. Francis, etc.*

All the great encyclicals, allocutions, epistles and constitutions of Leo XIII explain some point or other of Catholic doctrine; all these documents throw new and copious lights upon the doctrines of which they treat; all contain wise and practical rules of conduct. They repeat in part principles by which Catholics have always had to be guided; they propose and give precise form to others which were not so well known, and above all not generally observed, as in the encyclical "*De Conditione Opificum*."

All these doctrines and precepts should be for the Catholic "a norm of opinion and conduct." In every case the Catholic is obliged to conform himself to the judgment of the Holy See, to regulate by it his sentiments and his professions. This perfect and absolute obedience to the Holy See is, as was clearly explained by Leo XIII, in the encyclical "*Immortale Dei*," the characteristic mark whereby true Catholics have always been and are recognized. It is the *touchstone of Catholicity*. It is thus that the Church should realize the words of St. Paul: "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no schisms among you, but that you be perfect in the same mind and in the same judgment" (1 Cor. i. 1).

WASHINGTON, D. C.

* My learned colleague, the Rev. Prof. Thomas Bouquillon, D.D., has published a collection of encyclicals and other documents emanating from Leo XIII, in which the contents are in each case clearly and judiciously indicated in marginal notes. Its title-page is as follows: "*Sanctissimi Domini Nostri Leonis Papa XIII., Allocutiones, Epistolæ, Constitutiones aliasque Acta præcipua. Vol. I., 1878-1882; Vol. II., 1883-1887. Typis Societatis Sancti Augustini. Desclée, De Brouwer et Soc., Brugis et Insulis, 1887.*"

BOOKS THAT HAVE MOULDED CHARACTER.

BY SAMUEL C. BARTLETT, D. D., LL. D., PRESIDENT OF DARTMOUTH COLLEGE.

From *The Golden Rule* (Udenom.), Boston, February 25, 1892.

IN speaking of books that have moulded character it is unnecessary to speak of the Book of books. That stands alone, both in its total influence and in the vast number of its particular texts and passages that have come home with critical and determining power to a great multitude of persons. Other good books are the reflection of its light and warmth. But it is of the latter only I shall speak, omitting also all reference to the ruinous influence of bad books, which would be a theme of itself and one of impressive magnitude. If the books mentioned be largely in the religious sphere, it will be simply because books of that type have been so largely the moulding influences. It does not appear that the moral philosophers of the best classic times, Plato, Seneca, Marcus Aurelius, and the like, ever formed a character to the practice of virtue by their maxims. Nor can we trace such influences, in any considerable degree, to the bright lights of literature, such as Shakespeare and Goethe, however much we may admire them. We must turn to a different class of works.

One of the most remarkable and influential volumes, Augustine's "Confessions," was written just before the beginning of the Dark Ages, so called. The portraiture of a soul in conflict, restless, lost, rescued, at rest and in peace, its profound introspection and fiery fervor, had a charm and a power that carried it into every Christian tongue, and gave it a singular and lasting interest and influence.

Second to it alone, if second to it, was another book written at the close of the Dark Ages, Thomas à Kempis's "Imitation of Christ," which is said to have been "translated into more languages than any other book save the Bible, and to have moved the hearts of so many men of all nations, characters, and conditions of life." Both these volumes are still unforgotten and occasionally to be met with. Of the same tendency, but of a far less extensive and protracted influence in modern times, have been Baxter's "Saint's Rest," and perhaps one might add Taylor's "Holy Living and Dying" and Law's "Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life." The "Imitation of Christ" is said, whether rightly or not, to have passed

through five hundred editions during the present century.

Probably no uninspired volume in later times has exerted a wider or deeper influence than Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress." It rivals, if not exceeds, the "Imitation of Christ" in the number of languages into which it has been translated, and certainly in the absorbing interest with which readers of every variety, old and young, learned and unlearned, have followed its narrative, finding each a special message to himself. Macaulay well calls it "that wonderful book" which "has been read by many thousands with tears," and, he might have added, by many hundred thousands with lasting benefit.

Half a century later came another work, Butler's "Analogy between Religion and Nature," which has undoubtedly moulded character by stimulating clear, broad, solid thinking more effectually than any other book in the English language. It is a volume not for easy reading, but for hard study. It has enlightened and settled many of the strongest thinkers, to the present day, and, though ignored and sometimes sneered at in recent times, in the line of argument it has not been answered.

I will not include in the list the famous "Thoughts" and "Provincial Letters" of Pascal, for, although the former did much for the thinking of Europe and the other contributed largely to the expulsion of the Jesuits from France, they had to do less directly with character. It is difficult, however, to estimate the full effects of John Foster's "Essays on Decision of Character." The book was a power in its day, and is a power not yet spent. There are few better tonics for the young. Very different in method and in weight is Edward Everett Hale's "Ten Times One is Ten," yet deserving a passing mention for the wide currency it has given to those four great maxims on page 130, the first three of which are a compact rendering of Philipians 3 : 13, 14, and the fourth a familiar condensation of Galatians 6 : 10, and other like passages. Fifty years ago the young men of England and America were powerfully affected by Carlyle's vigorous onslaughts on "Shams," as conveyed in his "Heroes and Hero-Worship," and in his writings generally, and a more limited circle have been invigorated by the essays of Emerson, the central force of which is embodied in that on self-reliance. Jacob Abbott's "Young Christian" did a good work in its day for many young persons, and Todd's "Student's Manual" had a whole-

some popularity and a great circulation in this country and in England.

As books have multiplied in later years so marvellously, each is necessarily restricted to a more limited sphere, and it is difficult to fix upon treatises that have influenced men on so broad a scale as of old. But such a book as Smiles's "Self-Help" deserves to be mentioned as one which must have nerved up many a reader to faithful and persevering effort. It is a profitable volume for any young man.

In recent times books of formal instruction and counsel are giving way to those which stimulate and encourage by the presentation of living examples. No doubt such kinds of influence have always been exerted to an extent which cannot be adequately set forth, for the reason that many a life has been shaped by a book or some striking suggestion in a book, which has never been put on record. Sometimes it is, so to speak, accidental and incidental, deriving its force from the peculiar state of mind in the reader. It was not to be expected that the perusal of Cook's voyages should have turned William Carey to the work of a foreign missionary. It was more natural that Schliemann's purpose to excavate Troy crystallized when he was eight years old and saw in Jerrer's Universal History an engraving representing Troy in flames, with its huge walls and Scæan gate. It was still more natural that Hugh Miller, as he tells us, became "thoroughly a Scot" in his tenth year, when he read Blind Harry's "Wallace," and the desire to be a sailor, with which he had vexed his mother, passed away.

This leads to the suggestion that to a great degree in former times, and to a still greater degree in recent times, good biographies of the best men in the various lines of life have been among the most effective of all moulding agencies. There is no more attractive and no more useful reading for the young, considered with reference to its direct influence on the character for good, and often in unexpected ways. There surely was little in common between the rigid and, many would say, bigoted Puritan, Cotton Mather, and Benjamin Franklin, the typical man of this world. But Mather wrote a book, "Essays to Do Good," now known to few readers, founded on his own life, and to the early reading of this book Franklin attributed his own usefulness and success. How many men besides Samuel Drew and others who have referred to the fact have had their lives shaped by Franklin's autobiography we can only conjecture. How

many of the best teachers in England and America for the last forty or fifty years have felt the power, directly or indirectly, of Stanley's life of Arnold! And it is noteworthy that the lives of the noblest men are those whose effects can be most distinctly traced. It is so in high art and so in the spheres of philanthropy and religion. The life of a great painter stimulated Reynolds to his life-work, and the career of Reynolds decided that of Haydon. Luther is said to have been greatly encouraged and strengthened for his arduous task by the life and writings of John Huss. This tendency is remarkably illustrated in the missionary sphere. The life of Francis Xavier sent forth Dr. Wolff on his striking career; the lives of Eliot and Brainerd, profoundly impressing the mind of a mother, carried Samuel J. Mills to the missionary field, and the life of Mills prompted Sarah Boardman Judson. That of Harriet Newell moved Levi Parsons and others—more than will be known in this world. Buchanan's "Star in the East" drew Adoniram Judson, and Judson's own life and that of his wife have been doubtless far more influential. The impression made by the life of Henry Martyn in its day is indicated by the number of persons that bear his name incorporated with their own. In this same line of moulding power toward the same work are such recent books as the lives of two remarkable men, John G. Paton and Alexander McKay, and, twenty years earlier, Mary Lyon.

There is a set of biographical sketches that ought to have served a wider use than it has actually accomplished, containing the encouragement of example and success in every form of achievement. It is a pity that it could not be republished, with additions, and be placed in the hands of every young man in the country. I refer to B. B. Edwards's "Biography of Self-taught Men." It contains clear, condensed accounts of the struggles and victories of more than forty men who had passed away during the century preceding, and had left their permanent mark upon the world. It includes such names as Roger Sherman, Heyne, Professor Lee, Rittenhouse, Niebuhr, Davy, Thomas, Scott, Adam Clarke, Count Rumford, John Opie, Benjamin West, Captain Cook, John Hunter, Bowditch, Ferguson, Watt, Whitney, Milner, Sir Wm. Jones, and the like,—a goodly company, illustrating every walk of life. There can be no more stimulating and moulding reading than such lives as most of these.

If it be thought that in these suggestions religious books and the lives of religious

men preponderate, it is from the facts and the necessity of the case. These have been the greatest moulding forces. Comparatively few biographies of great statesmen, warriors, and public men, however interesting in the perusal, have any deep and abiding impression to benefit the life of the reader,—such lives, for example, as those of Walpole, Burleigh, Pitt, Fox, Clive, Hastings, Talleyrand, Metternich, Frederick the Great, Napoleon, and the long catalogue of such men. Perhaps the one impressive feature of these lives, when fully told—and it is powerfully impressive when seen—is the difficulties, discouragements, risks, struggles, emergencies, and hairbreadth escapes through which they almost invariably made their way, and the precarious tenure with which they held their places. All success is through discouragements and difficulties; but then, perhaps, it is greatest of all. There is one recent and remarkable exception to the lack of specific moral lesson, and that is found in the life of Abraham Lincoln. There are few more inspiring influences than his whole career—his early obstacles, his steady, sturdy struggles, his fidelity, his magnanimity and kindness of heart, his integrity of life, his powers expanding with his sphere and his faithfulness, his patience, his fairness, his justice, and his singular wisdom that had its fountain largely in a true and noble heart. It is an example which, we may hope, in the midst of all the restless strivings, false ambitions, selfish passions, and evil tendencies of the times, will shine forth and assert its power as long as the nation shall last.

Hanover, N. H.

DENOMINATIONAL SELFISHNESS.

BY EDWARD JUDSON, D.D.

From *The Examiner* (Dapt.), New York, February 25, 1892.

THE objects in life most worthy of search are often best secured, not by direct approach, but, as it were, around a corner. It is not by concentrating his attention upon himself that a man can best keep his body quiet and motionless. Let him, rather, fix his gaze upon some distant object of interest, and, without trying, he attains to the immobility of a statue. The carpenter on a high scaffold makes no conscious effort to keep from falling, but simply absorbs himself in the work he is doing. If you want to make a straight track across a wide

field covered with freshly fallen snow, you do not look down at your feet, but, fastening your eye upon some far-off pine, you walk straight on toward it. When sitting for a picture, you cannot by an act of will bring your soul into your face and assume a noble and impressive look. Forget yourself, rather, recall some exquisite rustic scene, or occupy your mind with some elevated and poetic thought, and you may be sure that your features will look as handsome and interesting as the nature of the case admits.

Health is not secured by direct search. We become hale and hearty by forgetting that we have any pulse and liver and stomach. The valetudinarian habit is sure to defeat itself. This is why physicians prescribe travel. The patient secures self-forgetfulness and an outward gaze. Unfortunately, we are not transparent like a jelly-fish. And since we are left in uncertainty regarding our interior economy, the imagination has full play. When our attention is withdrawn from the more recon-dite organs of the body, and is occupied with nature or society, we begin to mend. The same principle applies to art. The best oratory, for instance, is self-forgetful. "If you want me to weep," writes Horace, "you must first weep yourself." It is as Faust says: "If you do not feel it yourself, you will not get it by hunting after it." "You will never bring heart to heart, unless it comes from your heart." "If you are in earnest to say anything, is it necessary to hunt after words?" "Your discourses which are so polished are as unrefreshing as the mist-wind that sighs in autumn through the withered leaves." So with singing. You may try to adjust your vocal organs to produce a *crescendo*, but a better way is to have the bosom swell with a vast emotion.

We arrive at everything good in life around a corner. Happiness eludes our hottest chase, but dogs our footsteps when we turn away from it and walk in the narrow path of duty. The butterfly pleasure which the worldling chases from flower to flower alights on the Christian's shoulder. "All these blessings," Moses said to Israel, "shall come on thee and overtake thee, if thou shalt hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God." The beginner in the Christian life attains to assurance, not by directly seeking it, but by doing the will of God. Then Christ and the Father come unto him and make their abode with him. We approach Christian perfection by the pathway of self-forgetfulness and service of

others.
sake, t
" That
Suc
k
If you
Love
Ma
Give
Selfi
everyw
religio
that h
his ow
writte
With
they h
The sl
new li
tive de
ests of
repuls
in the

D
Eac
three
circle
fined
liovers
the c
These
social
which
they c
truths
disting
our se
nomin
less, i
be tak
zon o
vague
mers l
remin
local
and lo
Guide
Sheph
the en
zons—
Nov
wheth
Congr
witne
Each
sphere
is me
ment
opera
tian d

others. "Whosoever loseth his life for my sake, the same shall save it."

"That is the doctrine, simple, ancient, true:

Such is life's trial, as old earth smiles and knows.

If you loved only what were worth your love,
Love were clear gain, and wholly well for you;
Make the low nature better by your throes!
Give earth yourself, go up for gain above!"

Selfishness, however beaten and foiled everywhere else, at last takes sanctuary in religion. A Christian feels instinctively that he has a right to be selfish regarding his own church or denomination. Is it not written, *they shall prosper that love thee*? With many people, about all the religion they have is an intense denominationalism. The sleepest prayer-meeting is aroused to new life by an allusion to our own distinctive denominational tenets or to the interests of our particular branch of Zion. How repulsive is selfishness when she masquerades in the seamless robe of Christ!

DISTINCTIVE TRUTHS PRESENTED.

Each one of us finds himself bounded by three concentric horizons. The innermost circle is the local church, which may be defined as himself with those of his fellow-believers who habitually receive the bread and the cup at the same communion table. These little nuclei are grouped into a larger social organism called the denomination, which comprehends Christians, who, while they cherish with others the great essential truths of Christendom, stoutly hold certain distinctive tenets of their own. This forms our second horizon. We cannot find denominationalism in the Bible. Nevertheless, it is a stubborn historic fact, and must be taken account of. The outermost horizon of all is the spiritual church—that vague and majestic conception which glimmers here and there in Holy Scripture, and reminds us that all, whether members of any local church or not, who by personal faith and love accept Christ as their Saviour and Guide belong to one flock and have one Shepherd. Each one of us dwells within the embrace of these three concentric horizons—church, denomination, Christianity.

Now each denomination of Christians, whether Episcopalian, or Presbyterian, or Congregationalist, or Methodist, or Baptist, witnesses to certain distinctive truths. Each fancies that it embraces the whole sphere of revealed truth, while in reality it is merely engaged in rounding out a segment of the sphere, so that through the co-operation of all the whole system of Christian doctrine will finally assume in the minds

of men its full-orbed proportions. How futile, then, is denominational selfishness! For when a denomination has borne complete witness to the truths providentially committed to its charge, and they have little by little filtered through the consciousness of Christendom, and have become the common property and belief of Christians at large, then its very *raison d'être* ceases to exist. It has performed its mission. There is nothing left for it but to distribute its assets, put up the shutters, and go out of business. Denominational triumph means denominational dissolution. There is no copyright on truth. What we believe, if it is true, will be gradually believed by everybody. The doctrines which each denomination stands for, if they are true, will be silently appropriated by others, and it will not even get the credit of them. People will not join the denomination, but its truth will join the people where they are. All truth is essentially pervasive. The Christian world is becoming more and more like the England which Tennyson describes:

"A land of settled government,
A land of just and old renown,
Where Freedom broadens slowly down,
From precedent to precedent.

"Where faction seldom gathers head,
But by degrees of fulness wrought,
The strength of some diffusive thought
Hath time and space to work and spread."

INTERFUSION OF RELIGIOUS IDEAS.

Christians are not all going to become Baptists. I have given up that idea long ago. But whatever of the Baptist faith is essentially true, other Christians will silently appropriate without even giving the Baptists the credit of it. This wide, subtle process is constantly going on. The Baptists stoutly maintained liberty of conscience and shed their blood for it. Now, everybody believes it, without, however, becoming a Baptist. Baptists have always stood for a regenerate church-membership, holding that personal acceptance of Christ should precede the initiatory rite of baptism—that the inside should precede the outside, and not that we should put on an outside, hoping that sometime or other an inside will come to match it. Now Christians in general believe in a regenerate church-membership, and infant baptism is gradually passing into innocuous desuetude; but people do not on that account become Baptists. Again, Baptists believe that immersion is a holy, divinely appointed symbol, gathering up and expressing in sign language the great

central verities of the Christian faith, and that in symbols, as in all works of genius and art, the form, however inconvenient, is altogether essential, else the truth is not revealed by them, but obscured. Now, in many influential churches outside of the Baptist communion, you will find the baptistery quietly taking its place beside the font, and Bishop Potter tells me that a baptistery will be one of the most beautiful features in the Cathedral of St. John the Divine. I have used as an illustration the one of the denominations with which I chance to be the most familiar. But you may trace out the same process with regard to them all. The liturgical spirit and philanthropic energy of the Anglican communion is pervading the whole Christian world, and we even hear the most eminent Presbyterian divine in New York sighing for an old-fashioned Wesleyan revival.

The denominational partitions are all the time growing thinner, and distinctive truths are oozing and leaking through, so that we shall wake up some fine morning and discover, to our surprise, that the liquid in all the denominational compartments is substantially the same, and some of us with considerable reluctance will find that we all believe essentially alike. This is the unity we are arriving at, whether we want to or not. All Christians will not ultimately become members of one denomination either here or in heaven, but, little by little, all the truth that is preserved and witnessed to by each denomination will become the common property of all. It is a fair question whether, in many cases, when a minister finds himself strongly attracted by the features of another denomination than his own, it is not his bounden duty to remain right where he is, and sturdily realize, if possible, within his own communion the ideas and spirit which he admires, and not carry coals to Newcastle by joining another denomination, provided, of course, he does not radically diverge from the doctrines of the Christian body which he represents.

Will denominations then pass away? I think not. Names have always been more stubborn historic facts than things. A form will last long after the truth has evaporated out of it. Denominational partitions will survive as convenient division walls for Christian work.

THE FOOLISHNESS OF NARROWNESS.

If these things are so, how foolish it is for a human soul to cramp itself up by de-

nominal conceptions of Christianity! It is a significant fact that the communion which is advancing most rapidly here in New York is the one that has least to say about its distinctive dogmas, and is most concerned with matters relating to the worship of the Eternal, and with right methods of relieving the sufferings of our fellow-creatures. She cherishes the spirit so well described in the courtly phrases of Phillips Brooks: "The channel which is not wide enough to contain the full torrent of the spring-time is thankful that the drops she cannot hold find wayward courses of their own down to the sea; and at the same time she makes herself wider and wider, that more and more of the water may find way through her." There is a good deal of sound philosophy in the blunt dogmatic language of old Andrew Fuller: "It is an important principle, that where any denomination or congregation seeks only *its own*, it will be disappointed; but where it seeks the Kingdom of God and his righteousness, its own prosperity will be among the things that will be added unto it. I have seen great zeal for what among us is called the *dissenting interest*; and in such hands the dissenting interest has died. Had they sought more to make men *Christians*, they should in most cases have been dissenters of their own accord. In fact, I see that in those congregations where the main object is what it should be, there religion flourishes. The same may be said of Baptists. If the first fruits of our zeal be laid out in making proselytes to that denomination, however right the thing may be in itself, the Lord will frown upon us and leave us. But if we be mainly employed in making men Christians, we need not fear but they will be Baptists. It is of great consequence to pursue things according to their importance, making that a first concern which is first, and that a second which is secondary. In seeking the salvation of others a man will find his own."

It is by cherishing such sentiments as these that we shall help to realize that dream of church unity which sounds faintly in our ears like the premature song of a half-awakened bird before daylight. So shall we bring to pass the devout aspiration: "More especially we pray for thy holy Church universal, that it may be so guided and governed by thy good Spirit, that all who profess and call themselves Christians may be led into the way of truth and hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life."

From

IN a
gation
"the
ought
the pre
to add
tions of
ever I
dom—
me as
and I
values
greater
convic
the hi
preach
is the
into a
good
preach
awake
Eve
grumb
the de
church
period
preach
plain
they h
eral st
day is
much
from t
in the
averag
the he
These
crimin
style
congre
"the
preach
be a n
cle of
memo
and of
be qu
thing
over a
Or he
two id
a man
he wil
a long
ple so

ABOUT PREACHING AND PREACHERS.

BY REV. REUEN THOMAS, D.D.

From *The Congregationalist* (Boston), February 25, 1892.

In a recent article printed in the *Congregationalist* the writer begins by saying that "the preaching of to-day is not what it ought to be. Everybody says so, including the preachers themselves." I am not about to add a chapter to the book of Lamentations on preaching and preachers. Whenever I have an opportunity—which is seldom—of hearing a sermon, it always strikes me as being "much above the average," and I go away with the idea that the rise in values of sermonic discourse has been even greater than in Bell telephone stock. My conviction is that there never has been in the history of the church so much good preaching or so many good preachers. That is the reason why men have been educated into a still higher expectancy. It is the good preaching that has done it. The preaching has been so good that it has awakened the preachers and hearers both.

Every congregation has its percentage of grumblers. The supply is always equal to the demand. Also, the people outside the church, who never hear us preach, have a periodical propensity to complain of our preaching. Is it fair for ministers to complain of the preaching of brethren whom they have never heard? Moreover, the general statement that "the preaching of to-day is not what it ought to be" sounds too much like one of those stock phrases caught from the lips of peripatetic exhorters when in the humor to "curse Meroz" (i.e., the average minister) for not "coming up to the help of the Lord against the mighty." These general phrases are too free from discrimination to be just. There is no one style of preaching which is adapted to all congregations. Every congregation needs "the truth as it is in Jesus." But a preacher may be a mere exhorter. He may be a man moving within a very narrow circle of truth. He may be a man who simply memorizes other men's modes of utterance and other men's phraseology until you may be quite certain that he will say the same thing in the same form of words over and over again with no individual creativeness. Or he may be a preacher and teacher. The two ideas ought always to go together. If a man be not a teacher as well as a preacher he will never maintain his influence during a long pastorate, molding the mind of a people so that men and women grow in intelli-

gence all the time—of course almost imperceptibly, but steadily and persistently. Now, according to what the preacher is—whether a mere exhorter or a mere memorizer or a teacher and preacher—so his *mode* of preaching will be.

The style of preaching which is natural to one man is not natural to another. Whether it is better to adopt one style or another depends entirely upon the *temperament* of the man. A settled pastor, teacher and preacher, dealing with the same congregation all the time, steadily raising them in intelligence and religious culture, must not adopt the style of the revivalist or his tenure of office will be short. Mere declamation, however fervid, never yet built up into strength and influence a congregation of reliable, intelligent Christian men and women. Pastors in our days are too anxious for immediate effects, and so they adopt a style of preaching which seems to be an amplification and variation upon a very few passages of Scripture. The results come—but *what* results? The gourd grows in a day and perishes in a night. Oak trees grow more slowly, but they continue growing for years, and even when they are "cut down and withered" they are good for a variety of uses, one of the best of which is for coffins to bury religious grumblers in.

A preacher, if he is to be also a teacher, must study himself and know his own nature, his aptitudes and inaptitudes. Then he must be determined to be himself, and so to use himself mentally as to preserve himself for years of intelligent work. Then he must study his particular congregation. Each congregation has its individuality. With some not specially cultured congregations he can preach in an easy extemporaneous fashion. With other congregations it is fatal for any length of time. They will eventually take all you can give them, providing you do not act the professor, but be the teacher and preacher. The trouble with many of our ministers whose method is to use very copious notes, or fully prepared manuscript, is that they don't read. They don't know how to read. Reading is interpretation. There is no reading where there is no interpretation.

Confining myself to English illustrations, Liddon, the great canon of St. Paul's, knew how to read. Farrar, the great canon of Westminster, knows how to read. Henry Melvill, who used to fascinate and possess the crowds that heard him, always knew how to read. Enoch Mellor, the most impressive orator among English Congregationalists, knew how to read. James Sher-

man and his well-known successor, Newman Hall, knew how to read. Henry Allon, who has adopted the same method, has been the teacher of as well as preacher to the foremost church in London for fifty years. These men were not mere exhorters, mere declaimers. They were teachers and preachers. They filled people full of ideas. They did not merely stir feeling. They built up men and women into strength and beauty of character. The preacher who is not also a teacher, simply a declaimer and exhorter, can never renew the mind of his congregation so as to fill them so full of theologic thought that there shall be no room for doubt. It is of no use preaching anything but theology—a theology which is embodied, incarnated, in an attractive human form, but theology.

My contention is that any just ground of complaint that may exist in regard to the preaching of our time has been created by the adoption by preachers themselves of methods not natural to them, by the adoption of revivalistic methods in regular congregations of stated worshippers, by movement within a very narrow area of Scripture truth, by the appeal to feeling to the neglect of the intellect, the conscience, the imagination, and by the putting emphasis on something else than that which is theologic, the soul of man, the nature of God and the relation of one to the other.

PROF. PAUL DE LAGARDE, PH.D.,
S.TH.D.

A SKETCH OF HIS LIFE AND HIS WORK.

BY THE REV. W. MUSS-ARNOLT, PH.D.

From *The Christian Intelligencer* (Dutch Ref.), New York, March 2, 1892.

At the last meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, held on December 28th, 1891, in Philadelphia, Professor Paul Haupt, of our University, informed the society of the sudden death, on December 22d, 1891, of Prof. Paul Anthony de Lagarde. Although in nowise connected with the society, the President, our revered Dr. Chambers, and the members voted a series of resolutions to be sent to the widow of that famous Oriental scholar and Bible student. I hoped that the Nestor of the Dutch Church would publish in your paper a sketch of the man's life and work; his recent illness, no doubt, prevented such, and I trust that I may be allowed to say a

few words in memory of the *Scaliger* of the nineteenth century.

Paul A. de Lagarde was born in Berlin on November 2d, 1827; there he spent his early life, studied theology, philosophy and Oriental languages in Halle and Berlin, from which university he graduated in 1849. He became *privatim docens* at Halle in 1851, and later Professor in various gymnasia (colleges) until 1869, when he was appointed to the chair of Oriental languages in the University of Göttingen as successor to Ewald, when the latter, after the annexation of Hanover, was deprived of his chair by the Prussians on account of his Guelphic proclivities. With Göttingen his name will always remain associated, where he was known as the "lonely learned man." His prodigious and multifarious learning truly entitle him to the name of the greatest Semitic scholar of our century, as Prof. Gottheil, of Columbia College, New York, has called him.

His real name was Paul Boetticher, which he afterwards changed to that of "de Lagarde." It was under that name that he published his early works. Scarce twenty years of age he made his scientific debut with his *horae Aramaicae* (1847), and his *rudimenta mythologiae semiticae* (1848).

His main object was a critical edition of the "Septuagint," and his whole work as a critic and an editor of texts tended toward this, the task of his life. Lagarde's literary productivity was phenomenal even in Germany; scarcely half a year passed without the appearance of some carefully edited text or some minute and elaborate disquisition, throwing light upon the history and literature of Christianity, usually from Oriental sources.

In the comprehensiveness of his learning Lagarde stood absolutely alone; others may be more conversant with particular departments, for instance, Dillman in Berlin with Ethiopic; of whom the deceased himself said, that "he knows Ethiopic better than a native Ethiopian priest," or George Hoffmann (Kiel) in Phœnician, or the late Franz Delitzsch in Jewish learning—now, not even Theodor Noldeke or the late Professor Wright could compete with him all round. Noldeke may be his equal in the mastery of the Semitic languages, but Lagarde, while an accomplished Semitic scholar, was also a master of many other languages and many other subjects as well.

His studies ranged mostly round Biblical and Patristic literature. Again and again he emphasizes that he has never pretended or maintained to be anything but a theolo-

gian (p. 138, al lang sian an me for a mean sacred an Ori he was devotio worker Coptic Latin a the By him. for a gaged toward langua studies Isaiab, a MS. taining studies scriptio diction From by pre chiefly treatise Ignatiu in the fashion In t and lite Arama of the daica; rypha transla others publish of Psal he gave and Isa Hebrew made i manusc second of an A a numb to the Christi many a publish version Criti Prover the Sep were th work,

gian (*Symmicta*, Vol. II., 22); and *ibidem*, p. 138, he says: "My studies in the Oriental languages, with the exception of the Persian and Coptic languages, which interested me for their own sake, have only served as a means and a help for the study of the sacred records. I never intended to become an Oriental scholar and linguist." And yet he was *facile primus inter pares*. In his devotion to textual accuracy he was an ideal worker. Hebrew, Syriac and Chaldaean, Coptic, Armenian, Arabic and Persian, Latin and Greek, from the earliest down to the Byzantine period, were alike familiar to him. He even collected, in 1868, materials for a Baktrian Lexicon. In 1877 he engaged in Armenian studies and did much toward the elucidation of this little-known language. In 1883 he took in hand Persian studies and edited a Persian translation of Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel 1-10:4, from a MS. of Paris, with an introduction containing a sketch of the history of Persian studies in Europe, and a bibliographical description of not less than sixty-one Persian dictionaries in different languages.

From the beginning he devoted himself by preference to the task of editing texts, chiefly of versions of the Bible and Patristic treatises (the works of Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, Tatian, etc.), always in the most scholarly, exact and finished fashion that can be imagined.

In the field of Old Testament criticism and literature he had previously edited the Aramaic translation (the so-called Targum) of the prophets; the Hagiographa Chaldaica; the Syriac translation of the Apocrypha of the Old Testament; the Coptic translation of the Pentateuch, and many others of similar kind. For his students he published a fourfold translation into Arabic of Psalms 1-49; in his *Semitica*, I. and II., he gave critical notes on the text of Genesis and Isaiah, and minute descriptions of old Hebrew MSS. It was Lagarde who first made it very plausible that all our Hebrew manuscripts go back to an archetype of the second century of our era. The publication of an Arabic translation of the Gospels, and a number of Syriac and Greek texts relating to the New Testament and early history of Christianity have proved a great help to many a student. In the year 1883 were published *Aegyptiaca*, relating to Coptic versions of the Old Testament.

Critical notes on the Greek translation of Proverbs (1863), and a critical edition of the Septuagint text of the Book of Genesis were the promising forerunners of his great work, the Lucian text of the Septuagint,

which he was fortunate enough to reconstruct from MSS. for nearly half of the Old Testament. This edition of the Septuagint, the first half of which appeared in 1883, was the centre toward which all former publications, numbering upwards of fifty, and numerous articles tended.

There were, Jerome tells us, three recensions of the LXX. current in the fourth century: the recension of Lucian in Antioch and Constantinople, of Hesychius in Egypt, of Eusebius and Pamphylus in Palestine. Here also has Lagarde pointed the way to all laborers in this fruitful field. The principal MSS. had been pointed out previously by Dr. Field in the preface of his edition of the *Hexapla*, but they had not been edited. Lagarde edited them as far as Esther. It had been his intention to exactly determine the above-named three recensions and publish them in parallel columns, but his means and the lack of interest on the part of others did not allow him to do so. "Let him who would himself investigate and advance knowledge, together with other ancient versions, accustom himself above all things to the use of Field's *Hexapla* and Lagarde's edition of the 'Recension of Lucian,'" says Klostermann, a most conservative exegete, on page XL of his commentary on the Books of Samuel and Kings (Nordlingen, 1887). How far the second half of the Lucian text is ready we shall soon know; thanks to Lagarde's careful and systematic working, there can be no doubt that some one will be able to carry his notes through the press.

Lagarde's ideal of an edition of the LXX. was illustrated by him forcibly in the two specimens which he published in 1882 and 1887. In the former, entitled "Announcement of a new edition of the Greek translation of the Septuagint," he gave us a foretaste of the good "to be hoped for" in a critical edition of the first chapter of Genesis. Had he been enabled, able as he was, to publish the whole Septuagint on the same plan, it would have taken up at least twelve large quarto volumes of some 500 pages each. The Prussian Government, not long ago, voted a million marks toward a Latin Dictionary; to give but one-twentieth of that amount to help Lagarde carrying out his proposed work, they saw not fit. Another delicious bit he gave us to taste in his *Novae psalterii Graeci, editionis specimen* (1887). Underneath the text stands the critical apparatus, consisting of the readings of MSS. and the citations of the Fathers; at the foot of the page are annotations on the Hebrew text of the Psalms, with reference

to Semitic philology and the renderings of the versions. As stated in the preface, the MSS. and editions of versions on which the text is constructed are upwards of sixty in number, besides the quotations from the Fathers. The Greek text of Psalms 1-5, with the notes, occupies thirty pages, quarto. The notes, whether critical or philological, may be said to differ in kind from those of ordinary books; no one who has not seen them can have any conception of the marvellous erudition with which words or renderings, in many languages, are elucidated.

Of Lagarde's treatise on the origin of the Purim-festival I have, not long ago, spoken in the columns of *The Christian Intelligencer*. In his great work, "On the formation of nouns in Hebrew, Arabic and Aramaic," he excelled all his predecessors in the field of comparative Semitic philology.

It was his pleasure to publish his works in a form that was acceptable and pleasing to the eye, though it could hardly have been remunerative.

Minor articles, mostly on Semitic philology and the Bible, are to be found in his books entitled *Gesammelte Abhandlungen* (1866); *Symmieta* (2 vols., 1877 and 1880) and *Mittheilungen*, four large volumes (1884-1891). In these "Communications" are his famous critique of the ninth edition of Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon, by Muhlan and Volk, exposing the many delinquencies of its editors; his searching review of the German "Probeibel," the provisional revision of Luther's translation of the Bible, and an indispensable treatise, entitled "Old and new ideas and investigations concerning Christmas." No Christian minister can afford to ignore this tract.

Lagarde, by the way, was the first to explain the mathematical symbol x for the unknown quantity, which, observing that old Italian algebraic writers speak of an unknown quantity as *cosa*, "thing," he connected through Spanish, which represented "*sh*" by x (e.g., Ximenez pronounced Shemenex) with the Arabic *shai*, "thing." Thus x is an abbreviation of *shai* = *xai*, and has become the symbol for the unknown quantity. As soon as this origin of x [*ai*] = *ves* = *cosa* "thing" (= Greek *δύναμις*) was forgotten, the other letters, y , z , v and w became natural complements.

Lagarde belonged politically to the Prussian conservative party, and he has expressed his political views with great force and clearness in his *Deutsche Schriften*, and other monographs, which exercised of late quite an influence in his country. His educa-

tional views were so much like those of the anonymous author of the book, *Rembrandt as an Educator*, a book which, within a year from its publication, passed through thirty large editions, that for many months he was considered its author. His mental attitude, as a conservative Protestant, may be summarized in words that he used to apply to himself: "I accept nothing, but what is proved and everything that has been proved." His anti-Semitic position led to many a quarrel, and here, especially, he showed the defects of his qualities. In controversy he tended to be irascible and contemptuous of opponents; he did not recognize many as his equal, far less as his superiors. In social intercourse he was agreeable and cordial, of a kind heart and a generous hand. His sudden death has made a great gap in many branches of learning, and I know of none capable of doing justice to his prodigious learning. His works form truly a *monumentum aere perennius*; of the greater part of them it is impossible even to imagine the day when they will be antiquated. When most of us shall long be forgotten by the coming generations; when the big "chips from a German workshop"—to say nothing of the little imitation-splinters from a "Dutch workshop"—shall long have been reduced to dust and ashes, these gigantic marble blocks of "our scaliger" will be among the honored and highly-valued literary monuments handed down from generation to generation.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, Baltimore, Md., Feb. 22, 1892.

METHODIST BISHOPS, THEIR ELECTION, AND SEVERAL AND AVERAGE TERMS OF SERVICE.

BY THE REV. THOMAS H. PEARNE, D.D.

From *The Christian Advocate* (Meth. Epis.), New York, February 25, 1892.

THE relation of office-bearing in the Methodist Episcopal Church to the Methodist Episcopacy is suggestive. The following summary sketch will have interest:

Asbury and Coke were elected Bishops in 1784 from the pastorate.

May 12, 1800, Richard Whatcoat was elected a Bishop.

May 12, 1804, William M'Kendree was elected.

May 7, 1816, Enoch George and Robert Richford Roberts were elected—George on the first ballot and Roberts on the second.

May
on the
May
Heddi
both fr
had bee
vions to

May
John E
first bal
the pas
years as
broke th

May
Fisk, an
Bishop
sistant
Book A
clined t
could be
a Bishop
been Ed
vocate.

1844,
line were
Financia
Society,
Reposito

1852,
son, and
Scott ha
when el
nearly a
ing. Sir
Christia
pastorate
Secretary

1864, C
D. W. C
editors w

1872,
Wiley, I

S. M. M
Peck we
Peck we
was a Mi
and Merr
man were

1880,
H.W. Wa
Foss and
when elec

1884, V
den, W. I
ler were

was a p
teaching,
Fowler w

1888, J
Gerald, I
and Dani

May 13, 1820, Joshua Soule was elected on the first ballot. He declined the office.

May 26, 1824, Joshua Soule and Elijah Hedding were elected Bishops. They were both from the pastorate, although J. Soule had been a Book Agent for four years previous to his first election as a Bishop.

May 18, 1832, James O. Andrew and John Emory were elected Bishops on the first ballot. The former was elected from the pastorate; the latter had been eight years assistant and chief Book Agent. This broke the record of forty eight years.

May 24, 1836, Beverly Waugh, Wilbur Fisk, and Thomas A. Morris were elected. Bishop Waugh, like Emory, had been assistant Book Agent four years and chief Book Agent four years. Wilbur Fisk declined the office upon the ground that he could be more useful as an educator than as a Bishop. Bishop Morris had for two years been Editor of the *Western Christian Advocate*.

1844, Edmund S. Janes and L. L. Hamline were elected Bishops. The former was Financial Secretary of the American Bible Society, and the latter Editor of the *Ladies' Repository*.

1852, L. Scott, O. C. Baker, M. Simpson, and E. R. Ames were elected Bishops. Scott had been Book Agent for four years when elected a Bishop. Baker was, and nearly always had been, engaged in teaching. Simpson was Editor of the *Western Christian Advocate*. Ames was from the pastorate, although he had been Missionary Secretary.

1864, C. Kingsley, Edward Thomson, and D. W. Clark were elected. All three were editors when elected.

1872, W. L. Harris, G. Haven, Isaac W. Wiley, R. S. Foster, Thomas Bowman, S. M. Merrill, E. G. Andrews, and J. T. Peck were elected. Only Andrews and Peck were pastors when elected; Harris was a Missionary Secretary; Haven, Wiley, and Merrill were editors; Foster and Bowman were teachers.

1880, Cyrus D. Foss, John F. Hurst, H. W. Warren, and E. O. Haven were elected. Foss and Hurst were employed in teaching when elected; only Warren was pastor.

1884, William X. Ninde, John M. Walden, W. F. Mallalieu, and Charles H. Fowler were elected. Of these only Mallalieu was a pastor when elected. Ninde was teaching, Walden was Book Agent, and Fowler was Missionary Secretary.

1888, John H. Vincent, James N. Fitzgerald, Isaac W. Joyce, John P. Newman, and Daniel A. Goodsell were made Bishops.

Joyce and Newman were pastors when elected; Fitzgerald, Recording Secretary of the Missionary Society; Vincent had been editor and secretary for many years; Goodsell had for a few months only been secretary.

Forty-eight years of the first part of our history passed before any Bishop was elected and consecrated, except from the pastorate. Seventeen Bishops were elected from the pastorate; five Book Agents were elected, though one of them declined consecration; nine editors, six secretaries, and eight teachers; in all forty-four.

As to their average term of service:

The complete accuracy of the following cannot be assured. It will be found substantially correct.

Thomas Coke was fourteen years a pastor and twenty-eight years a Bishop.

Francis Asbury was a pastor eighteen years and thirty-two years a Bishop.

Richard Whatcoat was twenty-seven years a pastor and six years a Bishop.

William M'Kendree was sixteen years a pastor and a Bishop thirty-one years.

Enoch George was twenty-seven years a pastor and twelve years a Bishop.

Robert Richford Roberts was sixteen years a pastor and twenty-seven years a Bishop.

Joshua Soule was twenty-one years a pastor, four years a Book Agent, and forty-three years a Bishop—twenty years a Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and twenty-seven of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

Elijah Hedding was twenty-five years a pastor and twenty-eight years a Bishop.

James O. Andrew, twenty years a pastor, twelve years a Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and seventeen years of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

John Emory was fourteen years a pastor, eight years a Book Agent, and two years a Bishop.

Beverly Waugh was nineteen years a pastor, eight years a Book Agent, and twenty-two years a Bishop.

Thomas A. Morris was for twenty years a pastor, two years an editor, and thirty-six years a Bishop.

Edmund S. Janes was eight years a pastor, two years an agent, four years Financial Secretary of the American Bible Society, and thirty-two years a Bishop.

L. L. Hamline was four years a pastor, eight years an editor, and six years a Bishop.

O. C. Baker was three years a pastor, fifteen years a teacher, and nineteen years a Bishop.

L. Scott was twenty-one years a pastor,

three years a teacher, four years a Book Agent, and twenty-six years a Bishop.

E. R. Ames was a pastor eighteen years, Missionary Secretary four years, and a Bishop twenty-five years.

M. Simpson was four years a pastor, eleven years an educator, four years an editor, and thirty-two years a Bishop.

C. Kingsley was thirteen years a teacher and agent, eight years an editor, and six years a Bishop.

Edward Thomson was six years a pastor, twenty years an educator, six years a Bishop.

D. W. Clark was nine years a pastor, twelve years an editor, and seven years a Bishop.

W. L. Harris was nine years a pastor, twelve years a professor, twelve years a Missionary Secretary, and fifteen years a Bishop.

Gilbert Haven was five years a teacher, thirteen years a pastor, five years an editor, and eight years a Bishop.

Thomas Bowman, two years a pastor, one year an agent, twenty-six years a teacher, twenty years a Bishop.

S. M. Merrill was twenty-two years a pastor, four years an editor, and twenty years a Bishop.

R. S. Foster, twenty years a pastor, sixteen years a teacher, twenty years a Bishop.

Isaac W. Wiley, four years a missionary, four years a pastor, eight years an editor, twelve years a Bishop.

E. G. Andrews, ten years a teacher, eighteen years a pastor, and twenty years a Bishop.

J. T. Peck, twenty-six years a pastor, twelve years a teacher, two years a Connec-tional Secretary, twelve years a Bishop.

C. D. Foss, twelve years a teacher, eighteen years a pastor, twelve years a Bishop.

J. F. Hurst, eight years a pastor, four-teen years a teacher, twelve years a Bishop.

H. W. Warren, two years a teacher, twenty-five years a pastor, twelve years a Bishop.

E. O. Haven, twenty-eight years a teach-er, seven years an editor, five years a pas-tor, two years a secretary, and two years a Bishop.

W. F. Mallalieu, twenty-six years a pas-tor, eight years a Bishop.

W. X. Ninde, eleven years a teacher, seventeen years a pastor, eight years a Bishop.

Charles H. Fowler, eleven years a pastor, four years a teacher, four years an editor, four years a secretary, eight years a Bishop.

John M. Walden, five years a pastor, five years city missionary and Secretary of West-

ern Freedmen's Aid Society, sixteen years a Book Agent at Cincinnati, a Bishop eight years.

John H. Vincent, twelve years a pastor, twenty-three years editor and secretary, four years a Bishop.

James N. FitzGerald, nineteen years pas-tor, seven years Recording Secretary of the Missionary Society, four years a Bishop.

Isaac W. Joyce, twenty-nine years pastor, four years a Bishop.

John P. Newman, forty years pastor, four years a Bishop.

Daniel A. Goodsell, twenty-eight years a pastor, one year Secretary of Board of Ed-ucation, four years a Bishop.

The average pastoral service rendered by our Bishops is fifteen and one-half years. The average Episcopal service is precisely the same.

The longest Episcopal service is that of Bishop Soule, forty-three years, but only twenty of this was rendered in our Church.

The longest Episcopal service rendered in our Church is that of Bishop Morrie, thirty-six years.

CHRISTIANITY TESTED.

From *The American Hebrew* (New York), February 12, 1892.

It is not alone Christianity, but human-ity as well, that must perforce experience a sense of shame and humiliation at the de-plorable failure of the appeal made to the general public by the American Committee for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Russian Refugees, for aid in carrying on the gigantic work of caring suitably for the im-mediate needs of the hapless victims of bar-barous persecution at the hands of the Christian government of Russia.

No such appeal for assistance outside the lines of our own community would have been made at all, would not have been al-lowed to stand without widespread and ear-nest protests on the part of the representa-tive Jews of this country, but for the fact that it was practically invited by the public utterances of representatives of Christian sentiment, as the editor of the *Christian Advocate*, of the clergy, and Judge Dillon of the laity, to the effect that it was the sacred duty of civilized Christians to par-ticipate in this work of healing the wounds inflicted by barbaric Christians.

In the light of the professions and claims of Christianity, it is exceedingly discredit-able to the branch of it in the United States that there has been so meagre and so feeble

a respo-
dressed
been o
timent
savage
and th
notes
those
this co

Just
the un
which
moral
crisis
confro
the pu
body.
civise
tension
duty t

It w
trinal
to effa
the p
sions
obligat
of all
forth
That
take t
tion.
little r
in a m
suffere
of resp
As bet
sight o
who m
failed

TH

From TH

ALL
are in
comm
first th
tion, v
glory,
savors
trust is
entist
ment
should

a response to the appeal which has been addressed to its members; that so little has been done to organize the Christian sentiment of the country in protest against the savage brutality of Russia; that even here and there could be heard the discordant notes of dissatisfaction at the reception of those of the exiles who found their way to this country.

Just as in the life of the individual it is the uncommon occasion and the manner in which it is met that tell the story of the moral stamina of the man, so it is such a crisis as this and the manner in which it is confronted that tells the tale of the value of the public professions of a great religious body. Here we have a conclusive and a decisive test of the worth of the Christian pretensions to superiority in conception of the duty to love all mankind.

It would require a huge amount of doctrinal sophistry and dogmatic asseveration to efface from the mind of unbelievers in the postulates of Christianity, the impressions made by this rude neglect of a holy obligation; this unequivocal renunciation of all those ethical principles which are held forth to the world as peculiarly Christian. That the issuing of the appeal was a mistake there can now be no manner of question. It has probably deprived us of some little measure of self-respect. But whether in a moral sense we have been the worst sufferers by its publication and the failure of response, is open to considerable question. As between the two we would rather, in the sight of God and humanity, be among those who made the appeal than among those who failed to respond to it.

THE MINISTER AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS.

BY BISHOP JOHN H. VINCENT.

From *The Independent* (Undenomin.), New York, March 17-24, 1892.

ALL men true to the commonwealth are interested in all that pertains to the commonwealth. Whatever diverts a man's first thought from the welfare of the nation, whether it be personal ease, gain, glory, commercial or ecclesiastical success, savors of disloyalty. Apathy concerning a trust is infidelity to that trust. An indifferentist in politics is an enemy to the Government that protects him. Every citizen should therefore study the domestic, politi-

cal, industrial, commercial and religious elements which enter into the civilization of his times, especially as these are represented by the social system under which he lives. The State may change and be changed. Civilization is a growth; its laws and administrations, its tone and tendencies, may be modified. The individuals of the State are the social monads, the units, free and responsible, to which we must look for all changes; for through them comes all deteriorations, and all ameliorations and improvements.

The Church also demands the attention of all thoughtful and loyal patriots. The dogmatist, the pietist, the agnostic, are equally bound to give such attention, since religion, whether we like it or not, is so large a factor in all civilization. Whether it be an evil or a benefit, it must be dealt with when we come to estimate past and present conditions and future possibilities of society. The Church may change and be changed. Its theories may be modified, its creeds revised, its policies adapted to new conditions. The evil may be eliminated, the good may be enhanced. The individuals of the Church, as in the State, are the units, free and responsible, to which we must look for all changes; for through them again, as in the State, come deteriorations and advancement.

It is a problem how to bring into harmony the unit of the State and the unit of the Church, that every individual, being at his best in both relations, may contribute to the building up of a body holy and harmonious, in which State and Church, without any bond of legal recognition, are pledged to serve the high and many-sided interests of humanity. It is claimed by some, I know, that as to State and Church there must always be, if not hostility, divergence and disconformity, and that one must represent the secular and the other the religious side of human nature, which elements, it is assumed, can never be brought into perfect unity. A contributor to a leading organ of one of the modern schools of socialism, in his review of a recent book on Christian Socialism, says:

"The author attempts to make it appear that the true Christian religion is admirably adapted to solve the present strife between laborers and monopolists. I do not agree either with his religion or his socialism. I am quite sure that the labor problem will never be solved until the last vestige of religion disappears."

It is not surprising that a profound and practical thinker on social topics should say that the socialism of such a reformer must

be "a dream of impossible remedies for imaginary wrongs."

In the discussion of this subject I assume the reality of religion; the reality of the religious faculty or group of faculties in man; the reality of the demand in the human intellect for the recognition of a cause for the unity visible in effect through the universe of mind and matter; the reality of conscience; the reality of a moral realm; the reality of personal responsibility, virtue and benevolence; the reality of what Addison calls an "appetite" in man for immorality. It is because of this reality that we have and must have everywhere schools of religious thought, altars of religious worship, bonds of religious fellowship, centers of religious organization, agents of religious effort.

Given State and Church, each capable of modification, each composed of individuals, each having the possibilities of improvement, of degeneracy, of antagonisms, of adjustment to each other, there must arise in this manifold complication of personal and social interests—theories, problems, difficulties, competitions, questions of personal rights, of capital, of labor, of monopolies, of reforms—and all citizens in all relations of life, as parents, as neighbors, as believers in the unity of the universe, the reality of God, and the immortality of existence, are required to look with candor, carefulness and exhaustive thoroughness into these questions.

The problem before us at this time concerns the minister and his relation to these social questions. He represents as a citizen the State of which he is a part, and as a minister the Church of which he is an officer. What are his relations and what his duties to these ever-recurring important and embarrassing social problems?

We may here waive all controversial points, theological and ecclesiastical, and deal with the minister chiefly in his human relations. There is a *sacerdotal* theory of Church and ministry which puts emphasis upon authority, visible successions, outward symbols and sacraments, placing the priest above and the people below. There is a *pietistic* theory of Christian life, of the Church and ministry, which puts chief and almost entire stress upon inward experiences, aims and enthusiasms. There is a *practical* theory of the Church and ministry which makes much of MAN, his personal character and his human strength, and of the TRUTH as the medium of spiritual forces—divine forces by which, in harmony with laws of teaching and laws of influence, the

divine work of character-building is carried on. Of course it does make some difference which theory of the ministry one holds. If priest be prince and people be subjects, we have one idea of the Church, and one form of its practical outworking. If earth be naught and Heaven be all, if to get out of the earth and into Heaven be the chief end of life, we have altogether another conception of the Church and its work. If priest be one of the people, brother and not ruler, and if all people be kings and priests, and priest be servant to kings and priests; if earth be first and Heaven last; if Heaven on earth be the aim of the Church; if life here and now be a divine and blessed reality, and if personal character, race development, and a splendid, vigorous, material, moral and spiritual civilization—a Christian civilization—be the main object, accentuated by lofty spiritual aim and inspiration, our view of the ministry takes altogether a different complexion.

Waiving all discussion concerning these differences, I assume that the minister is a man; a man elected by men; a man called by the Divine Spirit; a man duly prepared on the human side, and fitly endowed by the divine; a man whose business it is to set forth in human words the divine truth concerning God, concerning man, concerning God and man, concerning man and man, which truth was first plainly, compactly, in clear light and authoritatively, set forth by the Man of Nazareth, who is to some merely man, to some supernal man, to others the God-man. I assume that the aim of the minister in setting forth truth is to bring men into subjection to truth—the truth as revealed and illustrated by Jesus; to bring men personally and socially under the control of truth—all truth spiritual and secular—that society may be brought in this present age into normal conditions—physical, intellectual, industrial, commercial, moral, religious, spiritual.

What, then, is the minister's relation to social questions? I might almost answer that he sustains no particular relation to any other question; that he has scarcely any other question to study; that he has almost no other object before him but to make clear, in theory and practice, the divine social idea as set forth by Him of Nazareth—the idea which realized will make men ready for earth and Heaven and bring the life of Heaven to earth—"the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness."

He is to be to men—to the men who compose the Church, and so far as he may to the men who compose the State—teacher,

friend
ple.
nized
is th
are co
He ain
those
is the
fer to
instit
reth;
men as
he wou
men r
spirit,

Acco
Jesus
restora
bold, c
which
he be
"won
His w
ticipat
wroug
tempo
connec
higher
human
called,
energic
sults—
realm i
of sin.
impote
the de
comm
est life
sibility
spirit,
and d
human
tion of
loftiest

The
the mo
relief
the de
good;
should
into fr
willing
istry.

His
fatherl
man;
sympat
what V
radianc
Wisely
man"

friend, guide, counselor, comforter, ensample. As such we may see that he is recognized under all ecclesiastical theories. He is the representative of Christ, and all who are connected with the Church of Christ. He aims to represent Christ to all, even to those who reject him and his theories. It is the mission of the wise minister to transfer to our civilization, our atmosphere, our institutions, in our day, the Man of Nazareth; to incarnate him; to live among men as he lived in the first century, and as he would live if he were in the body among men now; to talk his talk, manifest his spirit, reproduce his deeds of love and help.

According to the theory of the Church, Jesus came to assert the possibilities of restorative divine grace, and he did it in a bold, concrete way. He wrought "works," which were natural enough for him to work, he being what he was; but they were "wonders" to all and "signs" to many. His works were beneficent; they were anticipative and illustrative; they were wrought with a higher end in view than a temporary relief from bodily ailments. He connected them by his words with the higher relations and higher possibilities of humanity. His "miracles," as they are called, were promises in the realm visible of energies which were to produce larger results—"greater works than these"—in the realm invisible; deliverance from the apathy of sin, from the darkness of sin, from the impotence of sin, from the guilt of sin, from the death of sin. His whole career was a comment upon and a promise of the highest life, involving, as that life does, the possibility of pardon, divine peace, serenity of spirit, strength of purpose, the joy of hope, and delight in this life, the serving of humanity in all best ways, and the promotion of every great and noble element in the loftiest ideal of human character.

The work of Jesus of Nazareth, which is the model for his ministers, was a work of relief from all physical and spiritual evils; the development of all moral and spiritual good; the establishing of institutions which should promote these ends; the binding into fraternity and fellowship all who are willing to co-operate in such beneficent ministry.

His doctrines were social doctrines: The fatherhood of God; the brotherhood of man; the law of righteousness, of love, of sympathy and mutual help; the exercise of what Victor Hugo calls "those three pure radiances, truth, justice, and charity." Wisely does the author of "Murvale Eastman" say: "The Church has no right to

allow its enemies to outstrip it in the study of the means by which civilization may be fully consecrated to the improvement of human conditions." General Booth, in "Darkest England," in speaking of the "three million men, women and children, a vast, despairing multitude, in a condition nominally free, but really enslaved, 'the submerged tenth,'" asks: "Is it, then"—this submerged tenth—"beyond the reach of the nine-tenths, in the midst of whom they live, and around whose homes they rot and die?" He continues:

"Why all this apparatus of temples and meeting-houses to save men from perdition in a world which is to come, while never a helping hand is stretched out to save them from the inferno of their present life? Is it not time that, forgetting for a moment their wranglings about the infinitely little or infinitely obscure, they should concentrate all their energies on a united effort to break this terrible perpetuity of perdition, and to rescue some, at least, of those for whom they profess their Founder came to die?"

It is to set forth this mission of the Man of Nazareth that the minister holds his office. There are involved in the great redemptive movement mystic relations, profound doctrines, and energies of justice and love, all of which serve as inspirations to the true minister, who thus seeks to present the Nazarene of the first century with his mission to the men of the nineteenth. Back of the serene incandescent electric light, out of sight and out of hearing, are those energies of Nature in the engine room, jarring, burning, flashing, thundering; so back of all the peace which it is the mission of Christianity to promote in the individual and in society, are the great doctrines, struggles, agonies and victories of the mysterious life of its Founder. If at this cost a king came that humanity might be turned into a society of kings and priests, how can we overstate the responsibility of the Christian minister, as promoter of that new social era? The more we look into the subject, the more fully are we convinced that the great work of the minister is a social work, and that the problems which should knit his brow and torture his heart are social problems. What, therefore, are the duties of the minister, which grow out of his relation to the social questions?

It will be well for him at the very outset to appreciate the difficulties which are involved in this line of research. He is ill-fitted for his place in the ministry who fancies that all is clear as a sunbeam. The difficulties are ancient, inwrought into the very texture of society, involving multitudinous and most diverse interests, and

cannot be settled by the mere study of physical laws and forces; for man is more than a thing, and he is more than an animal; nor can we settle these problems by the study of so-called "social laws" and forces, which ignore man's individuality and the mystery of his personal freedom. To the minister who believes in a responsible manhood, all social problems, which grow so largely out of the abuse of this freedom, become doubly difficult. He must study these problems originally, comprehensively, and patiently; examining the various attempted solutions, the history of societary movements; the theories of the great thinkers among social problems from the days of Moses and Plato to the present.

The minister must study all sides of the subject; reading the books *pro* and *con*, books of history and books of fiction; bringing together men who know most about these problems for conversation and debate. He must know the social facts of his own church—the phenomena at hand, which will furnish him data for personal scientific researches. He must know the rich and the poor, the manufacturer and the employé, in his congregation, and in his church, where "rich and poor meet together;" and he must look from floor to gallery. In pastoral service he must visit from house to house, not merely in official service, but with the scientific enthusiasm of an original investigator, permeated with the good-will of a philanthropist who has large views and great hope. He should study the population of his own community; the various classes represented there; from what countries they came; what opinions they hold; what ecclesiastical and political convictions limit and restrain them. It will not do here to depend on supernatural illuminations. Prayer will not steer a ship. He must investigate as one left alone by the heavenly powers to find his own way.

The minister should confine himself to the distinctive mission of Christ. He does not have to deal professionally with the commercial or political relations of these questions, except, indeed, as a private citizen; and he must be his own judge as to how far the rights of the private citizen shall be allowed to infringe upon the sanctity and restrictions of his office; but as a minister he is to be a representative of ethical and religious elements as they are embodied in Christianity. As Judge Tourgée says, in "Murvale Eastman":

"The function of the Church as an element of civilization is not to prescribe methods, not to devise remedies; that is the function of government,

the duty of society. The function of the Church is only to inspire action, to provide impulse, to exalt and purify motive, to incline men to employ the Christ spirit to collective human relations."

A great change has been effected in governments by the embodiment of Christ's principles in our modern civilization, the enfranchisement of the people, and the placing of the *onus* of government upon them. One's personal relation to politics, where the government is wholly beyond the reach of the individual, as in the days of Christ, is very different from the relation he sustains where every individual becomes responsible for the character of the government, for the laws enacted, for their execution, and for the social and moral atmosphere in which the community lives.

The minister should professionally insist that every man who pretends to patriotism should talk and vote in the interest of pure politics, fair taxation, the improvement of the civil service, the increase of knowledge among the people of sanitary and hygienic law, the reconstruction of tenement-houses, the classification, education and wise care of convicts, a just distribution of wealth, free public libraries, industrial education, compulsory education, the care of the homeless and orphaned, the extension to all classes of the full benefits of our present civilization, the education of the people to high ideals of manhood, womanhood, and political responsibility, and whatever else grows out of a true knowledge of the Christian doctrine of the brotherhood of man. Every man should, therefore, talk and vote against drunkenness, against the saloon power, against child labor, against the use of a public-school system by unprincipled politicians, against intimidation of every kind, especially in connection with the ballot-box, against bribery, against fraud in business, against the ecclesiastical manipulation of politics and priestly interference with the public school. It is reported that church-members in America were known recently "to oppose a law prohibiting children under thirteen years of age being employed in factories and as cash boys." A writer on social science reports a large factory town in New England

"where strikes had been frequent, and where employers had constantly denounced the ignorance of their employes, shown, it is claimed, in these strikes and other ways. Realizing that there might be some truth in this criticism, a few of the wage-earners proposed a series of weekly economic lectures by men like Professor Hadley, of Yale, Professor Clark, of Smith College, Dr. Lyman Abbott, and others. The lecturers asked only the payment of their expenses, but even these amounted to something, and the cost of a suitable hall was

still more requested. The character of the gogism played soon the Yet the member in all political and moral wiser in racy, victory and

In thunder hath the world's progress

The people's opinions, never, he took opinion pher tempt ment to the commi ficially pose f of mon enter cure b evils w and so cured plied.

He boldly plication clare,

"The to relieve the head political induce . . . the strength his burden profitably to find from g rest to goods."

I could the duty of his men the good build The C

still more ; so financial aid and moral support were requested of the employers of the city, and assurance was given, as was indeed evident from the character of the lecturers invited, that no demagogism would be permitted. Not a single employer of those approached would give a cent, and soon the laudable enterprise had to be abandoned. Yet these employers professed to be loyal church-members. Query : How often and how earnestly, in all probability, did their pastors make any practical application to business life of the glittering moral generalities they preached ? How much wiser in this regard has been the English aristocracy, which has often led the way in securing factory and other needed legislation."

In such cases as this the pulpit should thunder, and lighten, and scorch. "Right hath its wrath," says Victor Hugo, "and the wrath of righteousness is an element of progress."

The minister must remember that the people whom he serves have their own opinions. These he is to respect ; but he is never, through fear of them, to forget that he too holds opinions, which should be the opinions of the great divine social Philosopher of Nazareth. The minister may be tempted to surrender his personal judgment and the law of his Master, and cater to the influential laymen of his church or community ; or, reading and thinking superficially, he may jump at conclusions, and pose for a time as a courageous denunciator of monopolists and other tyrants. He may enter the political arena, and attempt to cure by sudden and violent political action evils which are deep-rooted in the personal and social constitution, evils which can be cured only by radical methods patiently applied.

He has a right to present to his people boldly, plainly and affectionately, the application of the Golden Rule, and to declare, as one has recently well stated it, that

"The social function of Christianity is not merely to relieve want or exercise charity, but to incline the hearts of men in their individual, corporate and political relations, to refrain from doing evil, and induce them to assist rather than oppress the weak ; . . . that the strong should devote a part of his strength to enabling his weaker brother to carry his burden more easily, more successfully, more profitably, and that it is a Christian citizen's duty to find out if there is any way to keep a few men from getting more than they need, and helping the rest to get as much as they need of this world's goods."

I come to the third suggestion concerning the duty of the minister in the fulfillment of his divine commission to proclaim among men the divine message of "peace on earth, good will to men." He should seek to build up permanent institutions of help. The Church is designed to save civilization,

not to save souls from civilization—lifting them from earth to Heaven. It is to build up a kingdom of Heaven here on earth. There is great danger of obtruding too constantly the higher and supernatural elements of religion upon men who are not yet familiar with the human side of it ; just as though we were to subject a student leaving the preparatory school to the senior examinations as a condition of his matriculation in the lowest class of the college, or make a critical thesis upon a school of painting the only condition of admission to a picture gallery.

We need a church opened every day, and wise provisions for week-day contact with the people we would elevate and save.

When shall we have numerous, easily accessible and attractive *cafés*, public parlors, libraries, picture galleries, in the very heart of the communities most needing them ; lectures and art lessons for the benefit of ambitious young people ; people's palaces, concert and lecture halls, where, at the expense and under the direction of society at large, and in harmony with the loftiest moral standards of the Church, there may be provided every night scientific, literary, historical, biblical and art lectures, and entertainments varied, recreative, instructive and uplifting ?

When will the architecture of tenement houses be improved ? When will the *Familistere* and social palace of Guise in France, projected and carried on so successfully by M. Godin, be reproduced in our own land, where the love of man for man expresses itself in a splendid structure, with all the comforts of life, with kindergartens, playgrounds, schools of every grade, halls for lectures and concerts, and every other aid to the ennobling and refining of the people ?

The good Samaritan bound up the wounds of the man hurt by the thieves. He did well. He took him to an inn near by, where the poor man might be cared for ; and this was well. But "greater works than these" may be done, and are being done to-day ; for is it not better to have a hospital than an inn ? And would it not be still better if thieves were suppressed by force, or if by public institutions of learning, good homes, and the radical methods of the true Church, their characters were changed ? or, better still, if by wise training in youth they were prevented altogether from becoming thieves ?

The minister must consider carefully and discuss freely the relations and responsibilities of the so-called fortunate or wealthy classes. Viewed in all lights and relations,

it is not certain that wealth is of real and permanent advantage to its possessor. It may be, it is easily possible for it to be more harmful than useful. But wealth has certain advantages. It relieves its possessor from all anxiety concerning the personal comfort, present and prospective, of himself and family. It guarantees every advantage to his physical life, the wisdom and skill of the best physicians, wide travel, change of air and scenery, and all the healthful influence of physical environment. It gives literary and educational advantages, books without limit, conversation with scholars and specialists, who often feel honored by the opportunity. Foreign libraries, drawing rooms, picture galleries, are ready with their treasures, when he chooses to avail himself of them. Wealth gives him social standing, which ministers to self-respect, and affords that inward complacency which comes to him who knows that he is respected.

But wealth has great perils. These the ministers should thoroughly know. Physical perils, for example. A pampered body soon becomes a diseased body, and both intellect and conscience are likely to suffer from it. Children of wealth may be brought up in indolence, self-indulgence and dissipation. The very neglect which often comes from the claims of society and heavy business interests, transforms what would otherwise be opportunity for good, into greatest peril. Children of wealth are often trained with false views of others, and especially of those who lack this world's goods. They easily form a habit of patronizing the poor. Now and then a sense of superiority leads to the careless treatment of them, or to a raillery at their expense, to which the rich companion would not be subjected; an habitual feeling of indifference, perhaps a mild contempt. They talk about poor people as though they were a lower class of society, forgetting that there are just two classes of society—first, the noble and refined, rich and poor; and second, the low and coarse, rich and poor.

The children of the rich are in danger of becoming nothing more than bejeweled, white-fingered tramps in society. Girls in parlors, elegantly dressed, may be ignorant of the very rudiments of literature, science, art, and even of morals and religion. Familiar with the conventionalities of society, given to frivolities, indolence and a contempt for those whom they are trained to regard as their inferiors, they become really more pitiable than the coarse girl of kitchen or factory. These things the minister should

know, and both in public and in private speak with fidelity.

The rich have peculiar responsibilities. Where much is given, much is required. Especially should they give to home life the greatest care, spending time with their children, giving them just views of society and of duty, training them to reverence the high and holy verities of a true faith. Wealth is not a substitute for learning, learning is not a substitute for delicacy, courtesy and nobility. As mere wealth cannot give musical taste, learning cannot give conscientiousness, unselfishness, love and spiritual interest; therefore, in every home is needed religious training, and the ministry should labor to secure such faithful instruction from the parents.

The rich should *come in contact* with the needy and suffering, calling, grasping the hand, training their children to appreciate worth wherever it is, and to be full of the spirit of help. It does wealth good to go on foot now and then. Walter Besant, in one of his admirable stories, introduces a character who belongs to "that large school of philanthropists who would treat every painful case with half a crown and a basket of grapes, and so great is their sympathy with those who suffer that they cannot bear even to think of them, much less to talk about them." Wealth must expect to contribute to the building up and benefit of society. As Judge Tourgée says: "Society ought not to let a willing man fall into helpless poverty," and Frederick Harrison insists that "The true socialism is this: The use of capital turned to social objects, just as capital arises from social combination." Let the minister, therefore, give words of instruction as to humanity, education and political science, from the Gospel point of view.

Let him also give words of warning and reproof, showing men of wealth that it is a crime to use their great opportunities to so little advantage; and let him do this courteously, candidly and courageously. The charge is made by Judge Tourgée that the modern pulpit "preaches kindness, but it is careful not to rebuke greed;" and he boldly says: "If the Church would stop worshipping money, and let the world know that it regards the needless amassing of wealth just as unmanly and unworthy as an over-engorgement of food, that would soon become as unpopular as gluttony has among people of refined taste."

The minister should have words of *consolation* for the rich as well as for the poor. It is vain to suppose that wealth always lives

in sun
break in
The de
Pharaoh
of the
the des
are poor
side of
answer
pictures
hearse i

The
never s
gained
wealth
always
ten and
herited
of hono
fraud—
gold.

Were
should
ity amo
Dale,
"The
man, t
carry o
organiz
Christ
quires t
the wor
do his p
firm, a
And w
millions
is no w
of love,
try is th
est num
man is
function
also the
sonal an
the live

The
discuss
called
should
Master
the ric
disting
worthy,
tivated
as a mi
ministe
of the s
ishione
Calling
of the c
social p

in sunshine. Tears are wept and hearts break in the palace as well as in the hovel. The death of the firstborn in the house of Pharaoh causes as great grief as the death of the firstborn in the hut on the edge of the desert. There is a time when the rich are poor. They wail out their woe by the side of the silent, who will never again give answer to the cry of their love. What are pictures and statuary and luxury when the hearse is at the door?

The true minister of Jesus Christ will never seek the cheap popularity which is gained by the wholesale denunciation of wealth and the wealthy classes. He will always distinguish between wealth well-gotten and wealth ill-gotten. Honorably inherited or honorably earned, it is a crown of honor; while the wealth which comes by fraud—well there is a stain of blood on the gold.

Were the Christian theory to prevail, we should find increasing honesty and generosity among the magnates of commerce. Dr. Dale, of Birmingham, England, says: "The law of Christ requires the tradesman, the manufacturer, the merchant, to carry on his business under the competitive organization of modern industry, *as if Christ were the head of the firm*. It requires the clerk, the manager, the foreman, the workman, the porter, the errand-boy, to do his part *as if Christ were the head of the firm*, as unto the Lord, not unto men." And well would it be if these masters of millions could believe with Ruskin: "There is no wealth but life; life with its powers of love, of joy, of admiration. That country is the richest which nourishes the greatest number of noble and happy beings; that man is richest who, having perfected the functions of his own life to the utmost, has also the widest helpful influence, both personal and by means of his possessions, over the lives of others."

The minister must likewise consider and discuss the relations and duties of the so-called "poorer" classes of society. He should identify himself with them, as the Master did; visit them precisely as he visits the rich; give them the same attention; distinguish between the worthy and the unworthy, the refined and the coarse, the cultivated and the illiterate; but in his office as a minister help all as they need help. A minister in Boston, recently calling on one of the so-called humbler families of his parishioners, left a cheap printed visiting card. Calling the same afternoon in another part of the city, on a family occupying a higher social position, he left an engraved card.

The families being related to each other, happened to compare the two; and both did a bit of thinking.

The minister should aim to put every family at its best, remembering the power of home, promoting by all-wise ways a love of order in life, the use of wholesome food, the formation of right habits, the cultivation of good taste, and the development of the higher social elements. Victor Hugo says: "All the nuns in the world are not worth as much as one mother in the formation of a young girl's soul. . . . All the crimes of the man begin in the vagabondage of the child. . . . The two prime functions of the State are the nurse and the schoolmaster." The minister will find in these lowly homes some of the most charming and cultivated people in the world; for often in cottages Poverty keeps house for Royalty, and there abide delicacy, taste, genius, courage and faith. It is often the case that among a company of mechanics there are more wit, brilliancy, common sense, knowledge of human nature, than may be found in more pretentious circles. The conversation in lowly homes, where the boys and girls go to high school, and the elder members of the family, not having frivolous entertainments to consume their time, read useful books, is often more full of grace and charm than that among the splendors of the rich man's parlor. The minister will often find, even though Refinement has not yet taken up quarters in the lowly abode, such company and geniuses as Stephenson and Faraday, Edison and Grant, and a whole army of magnates besides. Here are the boys getting ready for college, the girls preparing to teach. There is in this city a lowly home, in which the boys, struggling along, are looking forward to Yale, and Father, who seconds their ambition, every day works with his own hands, keeping the same end in sight. Mother is a woman who lacked early culture, but she has a beautiful ambition for her children. She is herself a descendant of one of the oldest and noblest families of England. There is even a touch of royal blood in her veins. Blood that millions of money could not buy, courses through the veins of that humble family circle.

The minister will sometimes find an unreasonable prejudice against the rich among the poorer classes, all of which, being unwarranted, unjustifiable, and in most cases groundless, he will protest against. He will find a silly pride that is self-deprecating, as Amiel in his journal says: "The greater pride is the pride that undervalues

itself." He will find people who because of unfit clothes will not go to church. This he will rebuke. He will labor personally and through the agencies of the Church and community for the suffering; the people confined to the bed or the sick-room; the people with the thorn in the flesh; the people overworked, underpaid and underfed; the people with inherited evils, against which nobody has ever taught them to fight; the people who suffer from thriftlessness and dissipation; the people with breaking hearts over prodigal sons, vacant chairs and empty rooms. He will seek to reproduce in his church members the life of Him "who went about doing good;" laboring for the sinning without palliating their sins; finding in the poor an opportunity for justice and generosity; in the sinful an opportunity for pity.

Looking at these diverse classes in the social organism he will aim to promote a true equality among them; lifting and leveling up, not down; laboring to disintegrate the mass, that he may develop the units.

The true basis of ethics is personal responsibility. The sufficient freedom of the individual—sufficient freedom, I say, for while every man is affected by heredity and environment, the quality of moral freedom involves resources, personal and available, sufficient to overcome prenatal bias and the power of circumstances. Without these there can be no responsibility. Society indeed has its influence; and society has its measure of responsibility; but the individual must be held accountable by society, and the individual in society is accountable for his measure of blame where society goes wrong. One protest, one vote, one drawn sword, may create a social movement which shall sooner or later reverse the decision of today's majority. The true idea of equality is not that all men are equal in natural ability, in endowment, in resources, in position; but every one is the equal of every other in his right to the opportunity, so far as his fellow-men can give it to him, to put himself at his own best, and to work out his own personality.

The public school is an important factor in social improvement, in which the minister should be directly and constantly enlisted. The public school must not be degraded to suit the low tastes of the majority, but lifted that it may lift. The sons of the rich and the sons of the poor should be expected—I had almost said required—to attend the public school. President Hill makes this strong statement: "Universal ignorance gives us savagery, idleness and

famine; intelligent chiefs give us barbarism, slavery and poverty; an educated class gives us civilization, free labor and plenty; educated masses give us enlightenment, organized labor and abundance; universal education will give us refinement, intellectualized labor and wealth." This "universal education" is impossible without the public school universally patronized.

Whatever develops manhood, independence, self-respect, self-poise, self-control, will bring true men into neighborhood. When men of personal power meet with men of power, there come mutual respect, and a friendship of royal quality. It should be the aim of the Church to elevate and cultivate the whole community, to stimulate it to a higher appreciation of science, history, literature and art, always, of course, in subordination to love and the spirit of help.

The minister stands between conflicting classes, and belongs to all. He is, as the representative of a learned profession, as the representative of a divine religion, as a personal counselor and friend in the most solemn and important relations of life, admitted into all homes, on a level with the highest who have access there.

If to his professional position he add the power of a pure and high personal character, charming manners, genuineness, sympathy, culture, breadth, fervent and simple-hearted piety; that is, if to religion he add reality, and to reality refinement, he will have the highest place and the firmest hold upon people of all grades of social life.

But his power is in his wisdom. Frivolity, affectation, professionalism, egotism, self-consciousness, sensitiveness, indiscretion—these all weaken his influence; but even then people give him a measure of respect because of his profession, but it is respect marred by pity. Professional cowardice on the one hand or professional bravado on the other, a truckling or a defiant spirit ruins his influence.

There is a class partisanship which weakens his grasp upon all classes. A minister must not be apologist for the rich nor for the poor alone, but for both, each in its place, according to its needs and deserts. He has help for both, and according to the measure of need will be the degree of help. He will adapt himself to the boldness of the self-assured and self-exalting rich and to the sensitiveness of the self-conscious and indignant poor, and will rebuke both as occasion may require.

When a minister, without thought of political ends, carries out in his own pub-

lic tea-
sonal c
the G
and il
and m
and po
who,
they a
ply ma
ing po
courage
toward
man in

This
possess
patriot
tion t
This is
Heaven
Gospel
thropy
loved.
true m
teach,
BUE

RECE

B
From Th

THE
thought
to beco
The gr
out of
ence, t
—these
tial ch
preach
there w
away—
which
perman
religion
facts—
ing, an
Perman
same tr
Church
found
three t
ways—
ableness
years th
also gro
keep it
things

lie teaching, private conversation and personal conduct, the simple spirit and ideas of the Gospel, which he is set to proclaim and illustrate, he is rendering his largest and most effective contribution to social and political reform. He is the best patriot who, enlightened by Christian ideas, as they are applicable to the present age, simply makes known to men, with the convincing power of firm conviction and loving courage, the attitude of Jesus of Nazareth toward the individual man, and toward man in society.

This is freedom—to be imbued with and possessed by the spirit of Christ. This is patriotism—to apply to the life of the nation the doctrines and ethics of Christ. This is piety—to love and serve the God of Heaven and earth, as it is set forth in the Gospel and life of Christ. This is philanthropy—to love whom he loved, and as he loved. This is the true ministry of the true minister—to think, to be, to love, to teach, to live, as did the Man of Nazareth!

BUFFALO, N. Y

RECENT CHANGES IN CHRISTIAN THOUGHT.

BY THE REV. T. T. MUNGER, D.D.

From *The Christian Union* (Undenomin.), New York, February 27, 1892.

THERE are certain respects in which thought and feeling do not change except to become finer and deeper and stronger. The great predominant feelings that grow out of the heart of nature—love, pity, reverence, the social instinct, the sense of duty—these never give way, nor undergo essential change. Canon Liddon, in a sermon preached four years ago in St. Paul's, said there were three things that do not pass away—sin, suffering, and death; from which he argued that religion would have a permanent form. It is a main function of religion to meet these three unchanging facts—to deliver from sin, to relieve suffering, and to take away the sting from death. Permanent facts and conditions require the same treatment and call for an unchanging Church. Hence, in all ages, the Church is found doing, or attempting to do, these three things—often in poor and inadequate ways—and in this work lies its unchangeableness; in this respect it is "a thousand years the same." These unchanging facts also greatly influence theology, and tend to keep it from change. But there are other things in the world besides sin and suffering

and death—a malady, an incident, and a doom; there is the greater fact of *life itself*, with its manifold experiences and duties—a fact which outweighs a thousand times sin, suffering, and death. Sin is a malady to be cured and guarded against, suffering is an incident to be relieved or endured, and death is to be held subject to hope; but *life*, with its varying duties and phases and needs, is the chief field for religion, and indicates its functions. And because life goes on under ever-changing conditions, and shares in that mysterious movement which we call progress, religion itself will vary, take on new phases, use new forces, and become itself a part of the movement of the world. A true Church will always be healing the hurt of sin, always comforting the afflicted, always taking away the sting from death, and mainly in the same way; but it will vary its thought and teaching and work according to the unfolding phases of life. We are in an unfolding world, and the Church must unfold along with it. That this has not been freely done in the past has been the tragedy both of the Church and the world. A stationary Church and a moving world means fatality for both. The question the Church is all the while called to consider is, how far it shall change its methods, its forms, its beliefs, in order to keep pace with the changing world.

It is one of the hopeful signs of the times that there is an increasing willingness on the part of the Church to shape itself to the developing thought of the world. In just the degree the Church does this, it finds itself, it realizes its power and justifies its nature. But so long as it hides itself in the past, chanting ancient creeds; or so long as it says, "The present is good, let it remain," it defeats itself, forfeits its nature, and loses its hold on society. It is a cheering sign that the Church of to-day is awake and sensitive to the need of keeping abreast with the world. Within a very few years, and especially during the past year, great changes have come over the Church—changes in spirit and temper, in habits of thought, in belief, in aims and methods of work; changes embracing a new sense of the nature of Christianity.

No one can fail to see that there has been of late a great increase of *good temper* in the ecclesiastical and theological world. It is not fifteen years since one part of the Church was hounding another part over questions of eschatology, about which neither part knew anything; the sure thing was the bad temper of the critics. To-day this has mostly disappeared—a result not

caused so much by a change of opinion on the subject as by an increase of tolerance. It is far easier to differ with another now than it was even ten years ago. We contend and affirm and argue, but we no longer get angry, nor call our brethren who disagree with us fools or infidels, nor weep over them as lost to the truth. This change is due to several causes. First, Christianity itself, as we get closer to it, is breathing its own broad and gentle spirit over us; we are heeding its command not to *judge* our brother. It is also due to an increase of knowledge. The ignorant man cannot understand how any one can differ from himself, but knowledge, the broader vision, sees the possible truth on the other side; and the trained imagination takes in the fact that another may honestly hold an opinion which seems absurd to us. It is not so much general knowledge as the peculiar knowledge of the day that is working this change—that which comes from close study of other nations, and from close contact with all sorts and conditions of men. We are all of us to-day in search of the “soul of goodness in things evil”—believing it to exist; and the desire to possess the good makes us, in a sense, tolerant of the evil. Without doubt the best missionary is not the one who hates idolatry most, but the one who is most ready to recognize the good that may lurk within it. Men will never be brought together by emphasizing their differences, but by adding the knowledge of one to that of the other. The truth never comes by argument, but by each party showing what he knows, and comparing the results.

Another change rapidly coming over society is the immense and sudden growth of what is called *the scientific habit of mind*. I call it a new thing; it is as old as Lord Bacon, but for some reason it has not characterized the people at large until of late. Why they have been slow to adopt it, and why it is now becoming general, it may be hard to explain, but of the fact there is no doubt. There is a general readiness to connect cause and event, to ask *why* and *whence* and *for what* in respect to all things, to wait for the facts before forming opinions. Heretofore the world has lived upon assertions and prepossessions, especially in religion. The Bible was regarded as a series of assertions, and believed because of hereditary prepossession. If it seemed to say that the world was created six thousand years ago and in six days, it was not only not disputed, but it did not even raise a question. We no longer think in this way, not

merely because we have a better exegesis and exacter science, but because there is something pervading society called the scientific habit of mind that forbids it. It is a larger and finer use of the reason, and is as distinct from the older forms of thinking as the spirit of democracy is distinct from the monarchical spirit. It is, in reality, a new-comer into the world, and is fast becoming, as it should be, “the master light of all our seeing.” It is the harbinger of the unification of humanity. It is simply the right road to truth; as men follow it, they will find themselves coming to the same conclusions, and to general agreement. As this goes on, a great part of the confusion and contradiction that now disturb society will pass away. The trouble has been that men have thought of the Bible and religion in one way, and of government and social questions in another way. The present examination of the Bible is simply the application of the scientific method to its interpretation. When this is fully done, it will find fuller credence; it will be more used and more useful; it will enter more into thought and life; it will fall in with the other leading forces of society and work with them.

There is now but little doubt that a universal upward movement is going on in humanity; it is the secret of the world—God working in the heart of the race to will and to do—but the method and means of the progress is this scientific habit of thought by which men are led to think according to the same law, and therefore harmoniously; it is one of the divinest marks and pledges of human progress. It shows itself specially in clearing Christianity of its burdens of arbitrariness and blind tradition, and making it a clear and rational thing that men can think of and use as a logical factor in their lives.

There are abundant signs in the year past of the growth of this truer habit of thought. The settlement of the Andover question turned on a technicality of the courts, but its acceptance by the people is due to a general advance in thought. The revolution slowly going on in the American Board is due to the same cause. The hesitation to proceed with the trial of Professor Briggs is due to a growing unwillingness to interfere with a student who pursues the scientific method. It is actually coming to be understood by large numbers of people that if a student of the Bible discovers a fact such as the double authorship of Isaiah, it is right that he should state it. The call for a revision of the Westminster Confession

is due
ent ha
The el
and th
Newto
ing to
Very s
gregati
throug
dent,
qualifi
basis of
“We d
their l
ance a
already
and be
tion, th
that fo
general
great
persona
central
tion rig

Still
ceptanc
partme
gard th
valuabl
the pas
conduc

A st
though
Profess
Greater
not sty
secured
Ten ye
gated
lacking
find in
but se
men th
natural
day lif
and th
cord.
usherin
“Pilgr
Edward
“Chri
Homo,
called
tian th
of Dr
reason
age re
water.
It h
change
would

is due to the fact that it is foreign to present habits of thought, and is unscientific. The election of Phillips Brooks as Bishop, and the failure to bring Drs. Rainsford and Newton to trial are signs not only of growing tolerance, but of larger intelligence. Very significant was the tone of the Congregational Council in London, keyed throughout to the assertion by its President, Dr. Dale, of the universal and unqualified fatherhood of God as the only basis of a gospel of repentance and faith: "We do not tell men that God will become their Father as the result of their repentance and belief, but that because he is already their Father they should repent and believe"—a thoroughly scientific position, that was repeated in all the utterances that followed. Equally significant is the general acceptance of Professor Stearns's great thesis, stated at the Council, that personal experience constitutes "the great central evidence" of Christianity—a position rigidly scientific.

Still more significant is the growing acceptance of evolution as a guide in all departments of thought, requiring us to regard the present phase of truth as the most valuable, and forbidding us from looking to the past for standards of present belief and conduct.

A striking sign of a changed habit of thought is seen in the reception accorded to Professor Drummond's little books—"The Greatest Thing in the World," etc. It is not style nor aptness nor fervor that has secured for them a world-wide circulation. Ten years ago they would have been relegated to the limbo of "mere ethics," as lacking evangelical substance. To-day we find in them the very heart of the Gospel, but set to modern thought. They read as men think; they are intensely human and natural; the sentences palpitate with everyday life and with deepest spiritual truth, and the two are found to be in perfect accord. Books have played a great part in ushering in new phases of Christian life. "Pilgrim's Progress," Butler's "Analogy," Edwards on the Will, Dr. Bushnell's "Christian Nurture," Seeley's "Ecce Homo," Robertson's Sermons, have each called out and met a new phase of Christian thought; and now these little books of Drummond are showing how natural and reasonable a thing Christianity is, and the age responds, as face answers to face in water.

It has been feared by some that the changes induced by the scientific method would lead to decadence of faith and fervor,

and that religion would become formal and inoperative. Just in the degree in which men come to think of Christianity in a natural and rational way—*still heeding what it is in itself*—will it lay hold of them and appeal to their consciences. Hence we have a new phase of Christian activity, the special feature of which is rational adaptation to the present ends of society. It is intensely personal, and it is also thoroughly socialistic—the two poles of the Christian system. It is sometimes spoken of as the "forward movement," a phrase originating in England but becoming domesticated here. It stands for a fresh and deep consciousness of Christianity as an aggressive religion, and for a definite purpose to turn the life of Christ into a reality for all men and to repeat that life until every man is brought face to face with his Saviour. It means all sorts of missions among the poor, the neglected, and the degraded, from the Salvation Army to Toynbee Hall and the Oxford and Andover Houses—sample and end of more to follow. The origin and motive of this movement is that conception of Christianity which declares the universal fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of all men in Christ. Its growth has been great the past year—great in what is being undertaken, but greater in a certain spirit of confidence and strength begotten of clear conceptions of what Christianity is and of what it can do for the world.

THESE words of our Master—"What I say unto you I say unto all, Watch"—we will try, more and more, to learn what they mean. We know that they do not warrant us in watching other disciples with the eye of the critic or the censor; we know that this habit of mind is, above most things, hateful to Him. To watch ourselves lest we become suspicious and censorious and credulous of evil tales about our neighbors; to watch our conduct lest we hurt them by want of fidelity or want of sympathy—this, we know, is part of the lesson of vigilance that He seeks to teach us. But this is the smallest part of the lesson. To watch for hurts that we can heal, for halting steps that we can steady, for burdens of infirmity or trouble that we can help to carry, for ways in which we may give our thought, our care, our love, ourselves, for the enlarging and the brightening of the lives of our fellow-men, serving them with humblest fidelity, and leading them with cords of sympathy and brotherhood in the ways of righteousness and peace—this is the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.—*Gladden.*

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

THE BEING OF GOD AS UNITY AND TRINITY.

By P. H. STEENSTRA, D.D., Professor of Old Testament Literature and Exegesis in the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1891. 12mo, pp. vi., 269, \$1.50.

This book contains the first of three courses of lectures delivered by different individuals at the Cambridge Divinity School during the scholastic year of 1889-90, to supply the place of the regular instruction in theology by the late Dean Gray, when impaired health compelled him to seek a rest from labor. The lectures, as prescribed, were designed to cover "The Doctrine of the Trinity, with especial reference to the Father;" in other words, the first division of the creeds. They accordingly fall naturally into two parts: first, a general discussion of the Being and Attributes of God, from the point of view of natural religion, occupying six lectures; and then a discussion in four lectures of the Doctrine of the Trinity primarily from the point of view of the Christian consciousness.

The first part is clear and strong. Worthy of special attention are the discussion of the teleological argument and the chapter on the Attributes. The second part we can but regard as weakened in some degree by this choice of the point of view. It is, as will be seen, an attempt to work out the doctrine from the Christian consciousness as its source. Recognizing it as purely a doctrine of revelation, the author would have us seek that revelation primarily in the Christian consciousness, rather than in the Scriptures.

The intent of this method is clearly the praiseworthy desire to develop the doctrine in its vital relations to Christian experience, rather than as abstract, metaphysical dogma, to be believed solely upon authority. The author says well (p. 161) that "he who professes faith in the Triune God for no other reason than that the catechism has taught him that God is Triune," or even "that he finds it taught in Scripture," "does not really believe it." Nevertheless, we think the author radically mistakes the relation of the Christian consciousness, so called, to the inspired record of revelation, and this mistake involves him in not a few confused and contradictory statements.

First of all, he is driven to a new and therefore objectionable definition of consciousness. In the phrase, "Christian consciousness," it is no longer, as he points out, "the knowledge of our own mental acts, conditions, and feelings," but "in its widest etymological sense all knowledge shared with another or others." Dr. Steenstra may well speak of the "elasticity" of such a definition. He evidently feels the infelicity of the phrase, but retains it in deference to a prevailing theological fashion. But whence has this phrase its popularity? Why this elasticity imported into one of the most settled terms in the vocabulary of philosophy, unless, in the first instance, to gain for the Christian consciousness, thus loosely defined, a

semblance of infallible authority, which belongs to consciousness only in its strictest philosophical sense? It were much to be wished that so careful a thinker as Dr. Steenstra, instead of adopting, with a gloss, a term so liable to mislead, had substituted the more accurate phrase so wisely preferred by the late Professor Stearns, *Christian experience*.

The adoption of this starting-point leads also to conflicting statements in regard to Scripture. Thus we read on page 162, "God in history made the revelation: God in Scripture, through evangelists and apostles, recorded the great facts, and God in the Church, through the divinely illuminated intellects of the Christian fathers, interpreted the facts," a statement which certainly needs the correction it receives ten pages later, where we are told, "They [the Scriptures] not only contain a record of the facts [of revelation], but they interpret them and place them in their relations to each other and to God's eternal purpose." It leads also to the treatment of much the greater part of the New Testament itself—to wit, the writings of the apostles—as but the expression of the Christian consciousness of the primitive church. But the apostles did not speak in the name of the church. They spoke in the name of God, and offered their teachings to the church not as the product merely, but the norm of Christian experience.

From this view of apostolic inspiration as the mere expression of the Christian consciousness of the primitive church the transition is natural to regarding the utterances of the Christian consciousness of a later age as inspiration. This the author unhesitatingly asserts. He even considers it dishonoring to the Holy Spirit to deny it. "Shall we admit that in the Old Testament time of preparation God made use of chosen men, specially endowed by nature and fitted by life training, to lead and instruct His people, and then doubt that He has prophets and inspired thinkers in Christian ages?" But, then, why does he add, in the next paragraph, that while the close of this period of interpretative revelation cannot be definitely fixed, we may consider it for our present purpose as closed with the completion of the two great symbols, the Nicæno-Cosmopolitan and the so-called Athanasian? Why should it close at all? Why should there be "inspired thinkers" in the Nicene age and not in the church of to-day? Is not the Christian consciousness of the nineteenth century as well qualified to interpret the facts of revelation as the Christian consciousness of the fourth century?

The whole of Lecture VII. illustrates the embarrassments inseparable from any attempt to substitute as a norm of Christian doctrine the conflicting data of a variable and always imperfect Christian experience for the authoritative utterances of the inspired Word. The true office of Christian experience is to vivify the truths given in that Word, but which until received by faith and wrought into life must remain mere empty and barren dogmas. Nowhere is this relation of Scripture to experience more clearly illustrated than in that very history of the development of the doctrine of the Trinity traced in Lecture IX. It was a living experience of the saving power of Christ as a Divine Redeemer which infused fervor into those great discussions and gave the church its tenacious grasp upon the lofty truths for which it so earnestly and victoriously contended. Yet the final appeal through all was not to experience but to Scripture, and the great

creeds were forth in order, ing the Fa

It is on
peal to "th
impressive
of a most
by quoting
IX., Dr. St
fore him ho
to be exhibi
theology,
this proof
it bath ple
therefore l
be relegat
not shine t
year, Trin
yourself al
teaching n
order of th
must be e
after God
the spirit w
veloped, th
in the fulm
of the inv
Holy Ghos
all this no
but in the

UNION T

MENS CHR
OGY AND
FORT K
Seabury
Griggs d
\$1.

This is a
clearness o
pendent in
modern the
and sugges
fundament
the latest o
first five o
the studen
nary at Ca
mer Schoo
South. Th
selected as
ology as a
receive dev
practical qu
sion at the
Question o
tion, as Al
2. The Do
bilities of
Human M
Christian M
in God;"
Imaginatio
Those who
phy, Old s
ion, Essay
"Lux Mu
Incarnation
Lectures o
other kind
timely and

creeds were the outcome of an earnest effort to set forth in order what the Scriptures taught concerning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

It is on this practical side that the author's appeal to "the Christian consciousness" is strong and impressive. And we cannot better close this review of a most thoughtful and stimulating book than by quoting the words in which, at the end of Lecture IX., Dr. Steenstra pointed out to the young men before him how this truth is to be preached. "It is not to be exhibited as a matter of abstract philosophical theology, nor is it to be laboriously deduced from this proof text or from that, as a doctrine which it hath pleased God to reveal, and which must therefore be reverently believed. Neither is it to be relegated to one Sunday in the year. If it does not shine through all your doctrine throughout the year, Trinity Sunday cannot fail to be dreaded by yourself and a weariness to your hearers. The teaching must take the character and follow the order of the original revelation. The sense of sin must be evoked, the mute longings of the soul after God must be interpreted, that receptivity of the spirit which is the essence of faith must be developed, the Divine Redeemer must be presented in the fulness of His grace and love, the workings of the invigorating, inspiring indwelling of the Holy Ghost must be unweariedly delineated, and all this not in the dry form of dogmatic teaching, but in the warm glow of Christian experience."

JOHN H. WORCESTER, JR.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

MENS CHRISTI, AND OTHER PROBLEMS IN THEOLOGY AND CHRISTIAN ETHICS. By JOHN STEINFORT KEDNEY, D.D., Professor of Divinity in Seabury Divinity School. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co., 1891. 12mo, pp. vi., 201, cloth, \$1.

This is a volume of remarkable originality and clearness of reasoning, discriminating and independent in its discussions of the varying phases of modern theological thought, which will be helpful and suggestive to all who are studying the great fundamental verities of the faith under the light of the latest criticism. It consists of six lectures, the first five of which were delivered a year ago before the students of the Episcopal Theological Seminary at Cambridge, and the last before the Summer School of Theology at the University of the South. The author states that the topics were selected as such in which it was thought that theology as a unified system was capable of and might receive development and advance; or as touched practical questions of moment, and under discussion at the present day. They are these: 1. The Question of Jesus' Knowledge, and of Inspiration, as Affected by the Doctrine of the Kenosis; 2. The Doctrine of the Atonement; 3. The Possibilities of the Future, as Determining the Mode of Human Moral Activity; 4. The Functions of the Christian Ministry; 5. The Doctrine of "A Nature in God"; 6. The Impotence and the Right Use of Imagination in Dealing with Christian Doctrine. Those who have read Knight's "Essays in Philosophy, Old and New," or Allen's "Positive Religion, Essays, Fragments, and Hints," or Gore's "Lux Mundi," or Bampton Lectures on "The Incarnation of the Son of God," or Bonney's Boyle Lectures on "Old Truths in Modern Lights," and other kindred publications will recognize the timely and able contribution of Dr. Kedney in the

present volume toward illustrating, clarifying, and establishing a consistent trend of thought on these vital and all-important subjects.

It would be impossible in so brief a notice as this to attempt an outline of the author's admirable and forcible treatment of his several themes; they are each worthy of deep and careful study. In one of the most important discussions, the reality of "A Nature in God," after touching upon the distinctive opinions of eminent theological writers, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel, he presents a critical analysis of the thought-system of Jacob Boehme as adopted and interpreted by Dr. Martensen. It is true that Limborch and others had very accurately defined God as Spirit—as a most pure essence, immaterial, free of all bodily bulk and concretion, infinite, impassible, pervading all things, whose proper and essential act is to think—but it was still difficult to conceive how the chasm between pure spirit and the material world could be bridged over. Boehme, after patient and profound study, furnished a solution to the great question which had troubled the philosophers and theologians all along, reaching the conclusion that there is in and for the Eternal First Principle "a nature." While it may be said that this conception, in forms more or less obscure, is found in previous ages and is notably present in the Christian Scriptures, yet in Boehme's mind it was subjected to a rigid speculative analysis. Others have adopted his conclusions—Oetinger, Baader, the Roman Catholic Philosopher, Roth, Martensen, and Schelling—although the latter is not so closely in accord, whose speculation allies itself readily with a semi-panteistic form of doctrine, which our author characterizes as a sort of philosophic Sabellianism. In this scheme of Boehme, "Creation is a metaphysical necessity in and for the Divine Being; is that whereby he reaches true personality, and other personality becomes possible. Hence a determined universe is as eternal as the pure spirit-ground—i.e., thought and energy. . . . Martensen says rightly, 'When nature is affirmed in God, it is in comparison with what we call nature, something infinitely subtle and supermaterial—is not matter at all, but rather a source for matter, a plenitude of living forces and energies.'" Dr. Kedney more accurately defines "forces" in this connection as modes of the Divine Energy, in their movement and play, in their contests and equilibria, accomplishing concrete existence and change. This "nature" in God means, then, he says, the possibility of the material. From pure spirit alone you can never deduce the material. In the attempt to do so you simply postulate energy and thought on one side and an intelligent result on the other, with no copula, no connection, no affirmation, nothing that the mind can think between them. He happily observes, we do not know the absolute ground of spirit until it breaks into the distinctions of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—i.e., is determined, but we assume it, or are obliged to think it, nevertheless. But as the known universe is in movement and change, and undergoes development, there must be in the pure ground the possibility of such movement.

The right and wrong use of the imagination in dealing with revealed facts is set forth in the last lecture with a precision and force of reasoning that leaves nothing to be desired. Thus, among many other illustrations, in dealing with the Godhead, the subject we have been considering, our author shows the sad strifes and divisions which are rife from the attempt to supplement revelation with

Dr. Strong increases his claim upon American scholars by this condensed treatise on a theme which is just now attracting general attention. The special topics discussed are immortality, the intermediate state, the resurrection, and final retribution. These topics are treated from a philosophical and scientific as well as a scriptural point of view; the language is lucid, the argument clear, and the entire discussion interesting and instructive. The treatise will be read with profit not only by theologians and ministers, but by the people; it certainly deserves wide circulation.

After a brief explanatory introduction, the author proceeds to discuss the intricate subject of unembodied spirit, as seen in the infinite form in God and in finite form in the angels; maintaining the general doctrine that spirit may exist independently of matter. He then proceeds to consider embodied spirit as realized in man, bringing out the several lines of distinction between the natural life and the spiritual life, and showing that while the natural perishes, like other material organisms, the spiritual is invested with immortality or an eternity of being. Such eternity of being is held to be capable of adequate proof, however, only through the testimony of Scripture; and this eternity became in the case of saints, through Christ, an unending state of holiness and of bliss. The next chapter discusses the subject of disembodied spirit, proving first the possibility that the spirit in man may exist in a disembodied condition, and then inquiring into the condition, relationships, and experiences of such a disembodied soul. The author rejects as unwarranted the notion that the soul is provided with a spiritual body at death. He then inquires into its state and experience as one of continued consciousness and of unimpaired intellectual and moral faculties, in which, as is evident from Scripture, communion with God and with other unembodied spirits may be enjoyed by the holy. Biblical proofs from both the Old and the New Testaments are here adduced; among others the descensus of our Lord into the state or condition of the dead. To the wicked this must be a state of conscious loss and misery, to be exchanged at length for a more positive state of retribution.

The reembodyed spirit is next considered, with respect to the revealed fact of the resurrection, the nature both of the resurrection body, as compared with the present physical body, and of the fully glorified body in the heavenly state. The identity of the raised with the natural organism now inhabited by the soul is affirmed, though the nature of that identity is recognized as an inexplicable mystery. The glorified body will be luminous, ethereal, unchangeable, beatific.

The general discussion is closed with a presentation of moral probation as the necessary experience of man in the present life, and of the necessary termination of such probation at some point in the moral experience—a termination which from the nature of the case must be followed by an enduring state of awards. The form and way in which these awards come to the righteous and to the wicked respectively is not specially considered; but the certainty and the endless duration of this state are strongly affirmed on philosophic as well as biblical grounds. The curative or prophylactic element in law is said to be eliminated, but the punitive element remains, and this element is definitive and eternal in its action. Annihilation cannot be the result of probation or the issue of sin, neither can there be a second probation after death.

On the latter point the author is especially earnest and convincing, pronouncing the dogma not only altogether unscriptural, but without any basis in sound and just philosophy.

All in all, this little treatise may be commended as a helpful discussion of topics now attracting very wide attention, and around which much of both speculative and practical error seems to be crystallizing. The more faithfully such topics are discussed by such competent minds, the more surely will such error be rejected, and the truth of God be glorified.

EDWARD D. MORRIS.

LANE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, CINCINNATI.

JESUS CHRIST THE PROOF OF CHRISTIANITY. By JOHN F. SPALDING, S.T.D., Bishop of Colorado. Milwaukee, Wis.: The Young Churchman Co., 1891. 12mo, pp. 320, \$1; by mail, \$1.10.

Next to the difficulty of writing a good book is the difficulty of finding a good title for it; or, perhaps, rather the difficulty of finding a good title is the former and the greater. For the title is, so to speak, the problem to be solved, the proposition to be demonstrated, the subject to be expounded and illustrated; and unless an author has these clearly in his head he cannot write a really good book about them. Now what is the meaning of this proposition—the proposition to be demonstrated in Bishop Spalding's sermons—*Jesus Christ (is) the Proof of Christianity*? The subject of the proposition is the *Proof of Christianity*; and of this it is affirmed that it is not arithmetical—e.g., nor chemical, nor derived from the history of Julius Cæsar, but *Jesus Christ*. What is the meaning of *Christianity* in the subject? Is it a statement of facts, or a system of doctrines founded upon those facts? In that case *Jesus Christ* and *Christianity* are two names for exactly the same thing, and neither can prove the other. Is Christianity a form of human society, an ecclesiastical polity, a set of institutions such as religious orders, a loosely connected system of churches differing widely from each other, like the Anglican and Roman churches? That Christianity is no doubt well known to history, and if that is what Bishop Spalding means, this title is identical with this proposition, *That form of human society called Christianity, including its developments and corruptions and present condition, is proved by Jesus Christ*. But is it proved as a fact or as something right, Divine, beneficial, and the like? It is hard to see how or where Jesus Christ proved what happened to Christianity in the reign of Henry VIII. It is hard to see how anybody could prove that at the present time the papacy and the Reformed churches are all right, Divine, and beneficial. Probably Bishop Spalding means that anybody who believes the Church to be what he believes it to be can only account for it by accepting what the Church says about Jesus Christ. That is to say, everybody who believes *everything* that A says believes *each one* of the things A says; which is a very harmless and perfectly useless proposition. It is not at all surprising that the obscurity of the title corresponds to the obscurity or irrelevance of the lectures or sermons.

The first sermon, "Jesus Christ Witnessed to by Prophecy," is based wholly upon an exegesis which may, without offence, be called at least old-fashioned. The "higher criticism," at its minimum of admittedly demonstrated results, has assuredly modified the argument from prophecy.

Bishop Spalding's interpretation of the prophecies is an exceedingly ingenious attempt to show how they *could possibly* have referred to Christ, though neither the prophets themselves nor anybody else had at the time the faintest suspicion of anything of the sort. In speaking of the preparation of the world for Christ, he leaves out of consideration those vast masses of mankind—whole nations and "races"—such as the Chinese and the people of India, on the one hand, and savage races on the other, who made not the slightest discoverable contribution toward "the fulness of the times," and who have scarcely yet attained even the barest knowledge of the existence and life of Jesus. Like so many other apologists, he confounds "the world" of the Roman Empire with the actual world and all its human inhabitants. The sermon (xii.) on the "Great Forty Days" contains the usual assumptions, which may be true, which are certainly unverifiable, and which are wholly unnecessary for the proof of the Divine authority of the Christian Church.

We cannot imagine what possible service these sermons could render to anybody who really disbelieved either Christ or Christianity, because the very facts and principles here *assumed* are the very facts and principles which "unbelievers" insist upon having proved; but to *believers* they will be very refreshing. They put familiar truths in a new or interesting light. They draw desired conclusions from admitted premises. They are safe and conservative. For the class of readers for which they were intended, they would perhaps have been more effective if their positive assertions, offered on episcopal authority, had been freed from the encumbrance of a merely apparent argumentation.

WILLIAM KIRKUS.

BALTIMORE.

EVOLUTION: Its Nature, its Evidences, and its Relation to Religious Thought. By JOSEPH LE CONTE, Professor in the University of California. New York: Appleton, 1891. Second edition. 8vo, pp. xxii., 882, \$1.50.

"We regard the law of evolution as thoroughly established. . . . It is not only as certain as—it is far more certain than—the law of gravitation" (p. 275). So writes Professor Le Conte in the work before us. About the same time that he was penning these words, Professor Virchow, one of the foremost of European scientists, in a public address at the late ter-centenary of the University of Edinburgh, declared with emphasis, "Evolution has no scientific basis."

As one reads such conflicting statements, the question arises, How comes this conflict? On examining the book before us, the answer at once presents itself: Professors Le Conte and Virchow do not use the word *evolution* in the same sense; they are not talking about the same thing. The term *evolution*, as used by scientists in our day, has been not inaptly compared to the sheet which Peter, in vision, saw "let down to the earth; wherein were all manner of four-footed beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air" (Acts x. 12).

Charles Darwin, universally regarded as the father of the doctrine of evolution in its modern form, defines it: "The origin of species by descent, with modifications." And Professor Huxley, its most eloquent advocate, defines it in his words: "The evolution hypothesis considers that existing species are the result of pre-existing

species, and these of their predecessors by agencies similar to those which at the present day produce varieties and races, and therefore, in an altogether natural way." In this sense Professor Virchow undoubtedly understood the term when he said, "Evolution has no scientific basis." Professor Le Conte, on the other hand, in the opening chapter of the work before us, writes: "Every one is familiar with the main facts connected with the development of an egg. We all know that it begins as a microscopic germ cell, then grows into an egg, then organizes into a chick, and finally grows into a cock; and that the whole process follows some general, well-recognized law. Now this process is evolution. It is more—it is *the* type of all evolution. It is that from which we get our idea of evolution, and without which there would be no such word. Whenever and wherever we find a process of change more or less resembling this, and following laws similar to those determining the development of an egg, we call it evolution" (p. 3).

Such evolution as that presented in the case of an egg—while it is an *unfolding*, and so may be styled an evolution, if we have regard to the etymology of the word alone—is certainly not the evolution which Charles Darwin and Professor Huxley define. It is not "descent with modifications"; there is no "descent" in the case; and it does not result in the origination of a new species, but in that of a new individual of an old species; it is simply an instance of what is called growth-development, about the reality of which there is not to-day, nor has there ever been any difference of opinion among naturalists; and if it be "*the* type of all evolution," as Professor Le Conte affirms, then the doctrine of evolution does not solve the problem of the origin of species—it does not touch that problem.

The decisive objection to this whole doctrine of evolution, contended for by many scientists—Professor Le Conte among the number—is that it is irreconcilable with what, in the present state of science, we must regard as an established law of variation in organic nature—viz., that variations natural and artificial, many and great as they undoubtedly are, are all confined within the limits of natural species. The wild rose, for example, by "descent with modifications," has become the parent of innumerable well-defined varieties of roses; and the same may be affirmed of the geranium, but never in a single instance has a rose been transformed into a geranium or a geranium into a rose. Mr. Etheridge, whose long-continued connection with the British Museum has given him the largest range of observation on this subject of any living scientist, says: "In all this great museum there is not a particle of evidence of the transformation of species."

In the volume before us Professor Le Conte has done, perhaps, the best that could be done in support of the doctrine for which he contends. That he has given us a volume of interesting reading the fact that his book has reached a second edition is conclusive proof.

GEORGE D. ARMSTRONG.

NORFOLK, VA.

THE SONGS OF SAPPHO. By JAMES S. EASBY-SMITH. Published for Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.: Stormont & Jackson, 1891. 16mo, pp. ix., 97, \$1.

The translations contained in this dainty little

volume, the
his year as
served to fil
dent can a
Laying clai
to the text
reproduces
fragments
come down
in English
As a whole,
pleasingly
if occasion
what of the
of commen
attempt. I
ter class of

NEW YO

BR

Life and
Arthur She
Houghton,
\$2.) Even
add our tri
interesting
cient inter
dent to eve
interest is
and lucid,
it might be
gone a litt
the quaint
letters, bu
graphic po
had. To s
to characte
runaway J
of Mr. Al
dream of t
Christian
terest. Th
tory of mi
the history
At the sam
plain wha
the early r
which we
were unlo
ume before
whole fiel
serves, as
gent and a
Mark H
Williams
Series.
Mifflin &
The select
kins was c
friend. In
nently fitt
and his lo
among th
plete estim
material.
void of pic
profound
was for th
wisdom an
here told
It is not

volume, the author informs us, were made during his year as a senior in Georgetown University, and served to fill up many of those hours which a student can always steal from the severer studies. Laying claim to no deep research either in regard to the text or the life of Sappho, Mr. Easby-Smith reproduces in the original Greek the odes and fragments of odes, which constitute all that has come down to us, and gives us a rendering of each in English verse. The longer pieces are in rhyme. As a whole, the work of translation is faithfully and pleasingly done. The versification is smooth, and if occasionally we are conscious of missing somewhat of the fire of the original, we have only words of commendation for the honesty and zeal of the attempt. It is quite up to the standard of the better class of academic exercises of the kind.

HENRY M. BAIRD.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY.

BRIEF REVIEWS, BY THE EDITOR.

Life and Letters of Joseph Hardy Neesima, by Arthur Sherburne Hardy. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1892, p. 8vo, pp. vi., 350, \$2.) Even at this late date it may be allowed us to add our tribute of praise to the author of this highly interesting account. The subject itself is of sufficient interest to compensate for the difficulty incident to even a poor English style, but when this interest is joined to a style which is at once clear and lucid, the volume becomes a delight. Perhaps it might be questioned whether the author has not gone a little too far in so extensively reproducing the quaint English of Mr. Neesima in his earlier letters, but the total result is to give us a more graphic picture than we might otherwise have had. To say that the story is unique is but faintly to characterize it. One follows the fortunes of the runaway Japanese boy, the generous benevolence of Mr. Alpheus Hardy, his American patron, the dream of the youth, and its gradual realization in a Christian university in Japan, with unflagging interest. The author has not attempted to give a history of missions in Japan, but only a fragment of the history as seen in the labors of one worker. At the same time he has succeeded in making very plain what the problems were which confronted the early missionaries, and the grand opportunities which were opened up when the gates of Japan were unlocked to Western civilization. The volume before us is thus one of the most notable in the whole field of missionary biography, and it deserves, as it has had, a very wide circle of intelligent and appreciative readers.

Mark Hopkins, by Franklin Carter, President of Williams College. (American Religious Leaders Series. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1892, 12mo, pp. xi., 375, \$1.25.) The selection of the biographer of President Hopkins was excellent: pupil, colleague, admirer, and friend. Inclusion in the present series is also eminently fitting. "His endowments, his attainments, and his long service made him a unique figure among the teachers of this age. But for a complete estimate of him as a man, there is a lack of material. . . . His life in a country town was devoid of picturesque and varying incident. . . . His profound and far-reaching influence in the country was for that reason all the surer testimony to the wisdom and power of his manhood." The story here told is very complete and satisfactory, though it is not presented in the ordinary chronological

order. The treatment is topical under the following heads: Early Years; The Professor; The College; The Administrator; The Rebellion of 1868; The Teacher; The Author; The Preacher; The President of the American Board; The Crisis in the Board of Missions; The Friend; The Theologian; The Closing Years; The Final Tribute. A chronological table of the principal events in President Hopkins's life is very instructive, and the list of his published writings, with just ninety entries, is somewhat surprising not only for its number but for its variety. The index is full and complete. It is difficult to select from the many chapters of the book any one for special mention. Those which we have read with most interest are entitled "The Rebellion of 1868," showing his ability in the face of very grave difficulty, and "President of the A. B. C. F. M.," and "The Crisis in the Board of Missions." But these references cannot be made to the disparagement of the other chapters. The thanks of all persons interested are due to the author for this labor of love.

The Organic Union of American Methodism, by Bishop S. M. Merrill. (Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe; New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1892, 12mo, pp. 112, 45 cents.) It is a strange and sad thing that the most evident traces of our late sectional controversies are to be found in the churches. The discussion of union is one that is of vast import and far-reaching results. But looking from the outside, we may be pardoned the expression of a serious doubt whether reunion is to come through a fighting over the old fields and a waving of the old battle flags, as Bishop Merrill seems to anticipate. That is more likely to be the happy reuniting bond which shall "assure recognition and co-operation in the working field." Organic union will have to be based upon practical grounds, and it will never come, at least not in many a long day yet, by the acknowledgment that one or other party acted "illegally." The book, as a whole, is extremely candid, but Bishop Merrill might have improved it by the excision of some words and phrases which are irritating rather than irenic, polemic not politic.

The Bishop Hill Colony, a religious communistic settlement in Henry County, Illinois, by Michael A. Mikkelsen, A.M. (8vo, pp. 81, 50 cents.) The Johns Hopkins University is doing a good work in encouraging this series of studies in historical and political science, of which the present is the first paper in the tenth series. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, January, 1892.) The story here told is one of great interest, and the author has presented it in excellent shape, with a single exception. He has failed to give a sufficiently accurate and detailed account of the peculiar religious tenets of the "Jansenists," who composed the community at Bishop Hill. To a great extent this seems, however, to have been due to the reticence of the survivors, who were unwilling to go into the details of the matter. This is to be regretted, though upon the basis of the "Catechism," which the author seems to have known, it should have been possible to give a fuller account than has been done. Upon the whole, however, the author is to be congratulated upon his success.

History of Liberia, by J. H. T. McPherson, Ph.D., is another of the Johns Hopkins University Studies. (October, 1891, 8vo, pp. 63, 50 cents.) It is an exceedingly lucid though brief history of the inception, progress, and significance of the colonization movements which issued in the Republic of Liberia. The author should be encouraged to

proceed with the larger work on the subject, at which he hints in the prefatory note.

The Highest Critics vs. the Higher Critics, by Rev. L. W. Munhall, M.A., Evangelist. (New York and Chicago: F. H. Revell Co., 1892, 8vo, pp. 199, \$1.) A hot, indiscriminate, and shallow invective against the "Higher Critics," those "dishonest critics—destructionists," by a man who espouses the doctrine of "verbal inspiration," which he defines thus: "The original writings, the *ipsissima verba*, were given, word by word, from God," believing that it gave an "inerrable" record which has been preserved by a "large measure of illumination" in the work of transcribers, translators, and revisers; and all this because "at the last analysis any doctrine of inspiration save verbal means a denial of the supernaturalness of the Bible." Yet we make no doubt that the author thinks that he "doeth God service," though he reviles consecrated men who have devoted their lives to the investigation of the truth in and concerning the Word of God.

Meditations on the Life of Christ, by Thomas à Kempis. Translated and edited by the Ven. Archdeacon Wright, M.A., and the Rev. S. Kettlewell, M.A., with a preface by the latter. (New York: Dutton & Co., 1892, 12mo, pp. 11, lili., 378, \$1.25.) The editors have done valuable service in rendering accessible in English this little volume, which was well-nigh unknown in Latin. The history of the book is clearly set forth in the preface. That its composition by à Kempis should have been doubted or denied is not strange under the circumstances. It is good, however, to have this companion piece of the "Imitation" restored to us after so long a time. A quotation from the title page of the second edition of Kempis's complete works, by Sommalius (1607), in which the "Meditations" first appeared in print, may be excused on account of its quaintness: "This little book, concerning the life and loving-kindness of Christ, will be serviceable to those who are accustomed to pray aloud, and even to pastors and preachers, who from hence may (if they please) draw forth pious, devout, and spiritual conceptions, which they may advantageously set forth to their hearers."

Alone with God: a Manual of Devotions. Being a series of meditations, with forms of prayer for private devotions, family worship, and special occasions, by J. H. Garrison. (St. Louis: Christian Publishing Co., 1891, 16mo, pp. xiv., 244; cloth, 75 cents.) The title describes the contents very accurately. The spirit of the whole is excellent and the execution good. The author's object has been to educate and foster the devotional spirit, especially in the young. Many will most seriously doubt whether "forms" will be of real avail in this respect, but if that be granted, this little book will do good service.

Love and Forgiveness. Reflections suggested by "The Greatest Thing in the World." Translated from the German. (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1891, 12mo, pp. 48.) The reciprocal relations of love and forgiveness form the burden of this little pamphlet. Much of truth is brought out which is capable of profitable repetition from time to time. It is evident, however, that while Henry Drummond may have "suggested" these meditations, he did not write them.

Waymarks, 1870-1891, being Discourses, with some account of their Occasions, by Henry C. Potter, D.D., LL.D. (New York: Dutton & Co., 1892, 12mo, pp. viii., 883.) One acquainted with the pamphlet literature of this and other lands

knows of what great assistance those fugitive writings are in the construction of history in giving local and other color to the narrative. The volume before us is similar in character, though not in form, to those publications of an earlier day, called forth by extraordinary occasions. The sermons here presented have especial reference to the internal history of the Episcopal Church, though not exclusively so, for the range of topics is much broader. Sermons at the consecration of bishops, in commemoration of men eminent in various walks of life, in behalf of various benevolent objects, and on important matters of Christian ethics, make up the body of a book which is of great interest to all who possess even a small degree of catholicity. The title of the volume fittingly designates its scope, purpose, and contents.

Preachers of the Age is the name of a new series which has begun to appear bearing the imprint of E. P. Dutton & Co., New York. If the future volumes shall be as excellent as the two now before us, the publishers will render a good service to the Christian public. *The Conquering Christ*, and other Sermons is the title of a volume of fourteen discourses, by Alexander MacLaren, D.D. (12mo, pp. vii., 202, \$1.25.) Those who have read any of the former sermons from the pen of this gifted man need no further commendation, while those who have not should make haste to remedy their omission. *Living Theology* is the title of the first of thirteen sermons delivered on special occasions, by Edward White, the Archbishop of Canterbury. (12mo, pp. vii., 225, \$1.25.) Each volume is complete in itself, and a valuable addition to our sermonic literature. The insertion of a picture of the author as a frontispiece adds also to the value of the books.

Sermons on Old Testament Subjects, by H. P. Liddon, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., late Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's. (London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1891, 12mo, pp. xiv., 379, \$2.) This is the second edition of a book which is a valuable and suggestive addition to the homiletical library of the preacher. It is of no small moment to have the spiritual lessons taught in the Old Testament brought more prominently to the front than is customary. The vast majority of texts chosen for pulpit exposition and remark are taken from the Gospels and the Epistles. The writer has found this most thoroughly exemplified in the list of texts of one of America's most famous preachers for a half century. The Old Testament was practically ignored; yet such should not be the case, for truly it "was written for our learning." Deep study of incident, history, poetry, or even "drama" will reveal valuable lessons, which may be of profit even to-day. The present series contains twenty-five sermons preached during the years 1867-1887.

Pegs for Preachers: Points for Workers, by Charles Inglis. (Fourth edition. New York and Chicago: F. H. Revell Co., 1891, 12mo, pp. xi., 146, 75 cents.) A collection of over four hundred Bible readings and suggestive hints for sermons or talks. Some of them are excellent, and all have been put to practical use—so the author tells us. While they may be of service to some men, we are at a loss to imagine that any preacher with ordinary discernment would find it impossible to make a series of his own equally good and, for himself, vastly more useful.

Object Sermons in Outline, with numerous illustrations, by Rev. C. H. Tyndall, pastor Broome Street Tabernacle, New York. Introduction by

Rev. A. F. Chicago: F. H. Revell Co., 1891, 12mo, pp. xi., 146, 75 cents.) This book is a valuable addition to the library of every minister. It is a book of object sermons, and is a very effective and useful book.

The Sermons of Rev. A. F. Armstrong, D.D., LL.D., 1891, 16mo, pp. xiv., 244, 75 cents.) This book is a valuable addition to the library of every minister. It is a book of object sermons, and is a very effective and useful book.

The New Ways, 1891, 16mo, pp. xiv., 244, 75 cents.) This book is a valuable addition to the library of every minister. It is a book of object sermons, and is a very effective and useful book.

Systematic Missions, 1891, 16mo, pp. xiv., 244, 75 cents.) This book is a valuable addition to the library of every minister. It is a book of object sermons, and is a very effective and useful book.

The Church, 1891, 16mo, pp. xiv., 244, 75 cents.) This book is a valuable addition to the library of every minister. It is a book of object sermons, and is a very effective and useful book.

The Pastor, 1891, 16mo, pp. xiv., 244, 75 cents.) This book is a valuable addition to the library of every minister. It is a book of object sermons, and is a very effective and useful book.

Rev. A. F. Schaffler, D.D. (New York and Chicago: F. H. Revell Co., 1891, 12mo, pp. 254, \$1.) This book is interesting in two ways: to show what has been done and to illustrate what not to do. Undoubtedly there is much profit to be derived from this method of presenting truth, but the man who would use it must be possessed of an extra endowment of the "sixth sense"—common sense—else his exhibition will degenerate into buffoonery. But when effective, the method is very effective one way or the other.

The Sermon Bible, John iv.—Acts vi. (New York: Armstrong & Son, 1892, 8vo, pp. vi., 395, \$1.50.) "Each volume (complete in itself) contains upward of 500 sermon outlines and several thousand references, with 24 blank pages for notes." Unfortunately, the "references" are mainly to British periodicals and books inaccessible to nearly all Americans. In view of the "Traffic in Sermons" (see *Westminster Review*, February, 1892), these volumes present an improvement upon a prevalent British practice, and they are really a step upward; but with our American notions upon the subject, it is difficult to see anything about the book as it will probably be used, except a step downward.

The New Creation, by the author of "Our Family Ways." (Milwaukee: Young Churchman Co., 1891, 16mo, pp. 128, 50 cents net.) A treatment in simple language for the comprehension of children, of the Incarnation, and of various sacraments and rites of the Church, and all in a very churchly spirit and tone. It is eminently a denominational book, but as an example of simplicity in writing it is excellent.

Systematic Bible Study for Advanced Classes, by Miss L. L. Robinson. (Same publishers, pp. 170, 20 cents.) Instruction by way of questions and answers, nearly all of the latter being given in full. Considerable information is given in the book, but it might be improved in places by a little more study of the Bible itself. For instance, the statement that Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song "are all believed to have been written by Solomon" used to be true of some people, but on the face of the books it is evident that the assertion must be qualified.

The Church Catechism: its History and Contents, a manual for teachers and students, by the Rev. A. J. C. Allen, M.A., late principal of the Chester Diocesan Training College. (London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1892, 12mo, pp. xv., 216, \$1.25.) The title of this book is sufficiently complete except that in some American minds it might not be absolutely clear to which "church" reference is had; but, of course, this is simply ignorance and provincialism. The author has had much experience in teaching the Catechism, and has done his work in the present volume *con amore*. He feels the importance of this branch of Christian training, and strives to impress it upon others. He also perceives that only that instruction is worthy of the name which connects forms of sound words with right deeds and proper actions, instead of making them mere forms of words which end in sound.

The Psalmody of the Church: its authors, singers, and uses, by Rev. William H. Parker. (New York and Chicago: F. H. Revell Co., 8vo, pp. 269, \$1.50.) The author's motive in making this book was to arrive at something "readable," being dissatisfied with all previous works. But such a high aim should have produced a more notable book. It is a sketch, little more; at times expanded

unduly, and again contracted beyond patience: now stuffed out with "padding" of a useless sort, and again retailing the well-known incidents and well-worn tales as to hymn writers and their songs, at great length. It may meet the wants of those who are like the author, but a book whose main recommendation is that it is "readable" after this fashion is not to be preferred to the volume whose arrangement is alphabetic or along denominational lines. Doubtless, the ideal book is yet to come, but our judgment is that its writer will not "adopt some such plan as we have sketched in this little book."

The Adversary: his person, power, and purpose, a study in Satanology, by William A. Watson, D.D. (New York: W. B. Ketchum, 1891, 12mo, pp. 238, \$1.25.) A treatise which covers a great deal of ground, but which is unsatisfactory from the fact that the field is not well defined, the treatment is not exhaustive or even perspicuous, and the results are vague. The biblical evidence is not given in its proper order and proportion, and while the history of the doctrine may be of interest, the main importance attaches to that which precedes the history. To introduce "rappings" and other strange noises by way of evidence or even illustration seems to be credulity run mad.

A Chicago Bible Class, by Ursula N. Gestefeld. (New York: United States Book Co., 1891, 12mo, pp. 305, \$1.50.) An author who has so much to say about the "true nature" and the "underlying meaning" of the Bible ought to make very clear what these terms stand for. But let no one expect much light from this book; even if the exposition is here, though we have been unable to find it, it is so covered up by and hidden in such an obscure and complicated verbiage that the time needed to hunt it out would be ill required. Let a single illustration, taken almost at random, suffice. Speaking of the "Immaculate Conception," the author casually remarks: "Beginning with the Self-existent God—the one Mind which always was and ever will be, we start with the eternal Abstract which finds expression in its idea or image. This Mind and its expression or idea, which is the Concrete, bear the relation to each other or Father and Son or Cause and Effect. These are the God of the first Chapter of Genesis and the Lord God of the second Chapter, this Lord God being individualized God as consequent upon or product of the Abstract God—the One Mind—through 'the world,' which is the 'God said'—the creative power through which the Abstract produces the Concrete. The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—the primal Trinity, in Unity are God, the Lord God, and the 'God said,' which are the ever-existing and so are the foundation of Creation. The finishing of Creation or the manifestation of what God is, is the secondary Trinity in Unity—the Lord Jesus Christ. . . ." Let him who readeth, understand! We confess that this is not our "level in the thought-world," which the author asserts to be the "measure of the man." For our part we prefer an exact and scientific exegesis of Scripture rather than such a sublimation and emasculation of the Gospel as is here presented.

Julius Cæsar and the Foundation of the Roman Imperial System, by W. Warde Fowler, M.A., sub-rector of Lincoln College, Oxford. (New York: Putnam's Sons, 1892, 12mo, pp. xix., 389, \$1.50.) This is the sixth volume of the Heroes of the Nations Series. It is not written for scholars, but for those "comparatively unfamiliar with classical antiquity." To such the author has en-

deavored to make clear the character of the subject and the place which he occupied in the history of the world. His relation to Rome is indicated in the title. The volume is enriched by a number of valuable maps, busts of Cæsar, and other pictures, among which the famous "bridge" figures.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The Sunday Question; or, the Lord's Day: its sacredness, permanence, and value as shown by its origin, history, and use. By S. Edward Warren, C.E. (Boston: James H. Earle, 1890, 12mo, pp. 290, \$1.50.) Inclines to the too much rather than to the too little. A valuable contribution, however.

Consumption: how to prevent it and how to live with it. Its nature, its causes, its prevention, and the mode of life, climate, exercise, food, clothing necessary for its cure, by N. S. Davis, Jr., A.M., M.D., Professor of Principles and Practice of Medicine, Chicago Medical College, etc. (Philadelphia: F. A. Davis, 1891, 12mo, pp. vii., 143, 75 cents.) Calculated to be valuable for advice, warning, and counsel.

History of Circumcision from the earliest times to the present, by P. C. Remondino, M.D. (Philadelphia: F. A. Davis, 1891, 12mo, pp. x., 346, paper, 50 cents.) Medical; much more inclusive than the title indicates.

The Nonsuch Professor in his Meridian Splendor; or, the singular actions of sanctified Christians, by the Rev. William Seeker, minister of All-Hallows Church, Londonwall. With an Introduction by Rev. T. L. Cuyler, D.D. (Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 12mo, pp. 367, \$1.) A most remarkable, valuable, and pithy book; well worthy of republication.

The Man and His Mission, being a sketch of the life, labors, and character of Emanuel Swedenborg, with the distinguishing characteristics of his teachings, by B. F. Barrett. And Swedenborg's supposed hallucination, by Rev. John Goddard. (Philadelphia: Swedenborg Publishing Association, 12mo, pp. iv., 88.)

Thaïs, by Anatole France. Translated by A. D. Hall. (Chicago: Nile C. Smith Publishing Co., 1891, 12mo, pp. 205; paper, 50 cents.) A story that is scarcely a story, laid among the anchorites and cenobites of Egypt.

In His Own Way, by Carlisle B. Holding. (Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1892, 12mo, pp. 296, 75 cents.) An excellent story, suited to the Sabbath-School library. Its strong Methodist tone is no drawback.

The Hebrew Verb; a series of tabular studies, by Augustus S. Carrier, Adjunct Professor of Biblical Philology in McCormick Theological Seminary. (Chicago: Max Stern & Co., 1891, 8vo, pp. 33, 50 cents.) A series of tables, useful to accompany lectures, but somewhat bewildering without them.

Instructions Preparatory to Baptism and the Lord's Supper, by the Rev. Edward B. Hodge. (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, pp. 36.) Suggestive and useful.

The End of the World and the General Judgment, as foretold in Matthew xxiv. and xxv., by Rev. T. H. Tabor. (Chicago: Manford's Magazine, 1891, pp. 59.)

The Man of Uz, lessons for young Christians from the life of an ancient saint, by the Rev. S. A. Martin, Professor of Homiletics, Lincoln University. (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1891, 12mo, pp. 135, 50 cents.) An excellent little book, giving the usual view of Job.

Lays of Louty Screece, and other verses, by

Georgiana M. Taylor. (New York: James Pott & Co., 1892, 12mo, pp. 63.) A very pretty little volume of tender verse by the author of "Oh! to be Nothing."

SYNOPSIS OF LEADING ARTICLES FROM PERIODICALS.

UNDER the title, "The Christ and the Creation," the March number of the *Andover Review* gives an article by John Coleman Adams, Brooklyn, N. Y., which may take some readers with surprise, while others will recognize in it something which they have been expecting for the last ten or twenty years. It is a strongly pronounced theism that has the word here, but a theism bent upon assimilating whatever good pantheism has produced: or, to use more specific terms, it is the idea of evolution, which here is applied to what a generation ago was called the plan of salvation.

Starting from a remark by Dr. Martineau, that in the accounts of the evangelists and apostles the image of the real Jesus becomes confused and its living expression almost fades from view, the author protests that difference in the point of view necessarily involves difference of terminology, but not by any means a difference of conception. As the astronomer, the chemist, the physiologist may speak very differently, though they all speak of the sun, so the evangelists and apostles have spoken very differently, though they all spoke of the Christ; and with the ages as with individuals. The personality and work of Jesus Christ cannot be brought home to the reason and conscience of the nineteenth century in the same manner as suited the first.

Our age has another idea of nature and the relation of nature to God. To us it seems an impossibility that God should do anything unnatural or non-natural in a creation all of whose activities proceed from Him and are manifestations of Him. If we are able to comprehend the connection between God's providence in Israel and His providence among all people, and if we realize that salvation is the final step in all the upward march of man, we shall have no difficulty in considering the advent of Jesus the Christ as a natural event in the course of the world's history. As the nebula foretells the glowing sphere of earth, and the hot globe the hardening rocks, and the rocks the soil which can be ploughed, so the organs of the lowest creature living foretell the splendid organism which is in the service of humanity, and Adam is in the deepest sense of the words a prophecy of Christ.

The article, occupying thirteen pages, large octavo, is written with great cogency of thought and admirable lucidity of expression, and spreads light in every direction of human life and the history of the race.

James E. Mathieson, Esq., London, England, writes in the March number of *The Missionary Review of the World* on the "Persecution of the Russian Stundists." They were originally German immigrants to Russia. They came from Württemberg, and were settled in the southeastern part of European Russia in the beginning of the present century. They received their name "Stundists" from the German word *stunde*, "hour," because every day during one hour in the forenoon and one hour in the afternoon they gathered in one another's houses for public service, for reading the Word of God, and for prayer. Württemberg is the home of German piety, but it is also the birthplace of the German corporal's

staff, and thus hardly amire of the such an and esty, and found sym under I., w pressions a settled in l stances. T quiet, indu though they tizing, the Church, and the wrath o the policy o party to m government Therefore t sent off fro and therefo the parents dren shut educated in

Of Profes or, the Hi Year 800 B. says: Near an examina their place analysis of stated. Th higher criti six chapter The charac in revelati predecessor the prophet cerned. O was no roo seeing with ness and al preach reg points and lation of th tuary of Zi gestiveness treatment likely to p

In the M Scott, D.D. "Signs of ties," in w the presen various G

At Tübi only as a the founde of the No once startl one single site, strict have now palatable pose as ve of the Sta pietistic w

At Hei goes regu theologa diary " grand du pronounce

staff, and the slight peculiarity of the Stundists, hardly amounting to nonconformity, aroused the ire of the King of Württemberg. He considered such an anomaly as a personal insult to his majesty, and the Stundists were expelled. They found sympathy with the Russian Emperor, Alexander I., who was easily accessible to religious impressions and at the same time liberal-minded, and settled in Russia under very favorable circumstances. They thrived well there, and proved loyal, quiet, industrious, and progressive subjects; but though they did not engage in any kind of proselytizing, they made converts from the Russian Church, and that has now called down upon them the wrath of the Russian hierarchy. It is part of the policy of the present Czar and the Old Russian party to make Russia one not only with respect to government, but also with respect to religion. Therefore the Jews are bereft of everything and sent off from Odessa to Constantinople and Jaffa; and therefore the Stundists' homes are broken up, the parents being banished to Siberia and the children shut up in the Russian monasteries, to be educated in the Greek-Catholic religion.

Of Professor Duff's "Old Testament Theology; or, the History of Hebrew Religion from the Year 800 B.C.," the March number of *The Thinker* says: Nearly one half of the work is devoted to an examination of the religious ideas of Isaiah and their place in Hebrew religious history, and to an analysis of the writings in which those ideas are stated. The standpoint is distinctively that of higher criticism, and only thirty out of the sixty-six chapters are accepted as the work of Isaiah. The character of the prophet is determined as faith in revelation, and marks a distinct advance on his predecessors. Amos was the prophet of judgment, the prophet of despair so far as the sinner was concerned. Of his prophecy it may be said that there was no room for mercy in it. Hosea went further, seeing with deeper insight man's need of forgiveness and also God's need to forgive, but he did not preach regeneration. Isaiah combined earlier standpoints and centralized the faith in a material revelation of the gracious love of Jehovah in the sanctuary of Zion. "There is much freshness and suggestiveness," *The Thinker* adds, "in Dr. Duff's treatment of his subject, but also much which is likely to provoke adverse criticism."

In the March number of *Our Day* Rev. G. R. W. Scott, D.D., Andover, Mass., publishes an article, "Signs of the Times in German Theological Faculties," in which he with a few notes characterizes the present state of the theological study in the various German universities.

At Tübingen F. C. Bauer is now remembered only as a critic and scholar, but not any more as the founder of a school. The theory of the origin of the New Testament with which that school once startled the world is now not maintained by one single professor in the university. The opposite, strictly orthodox views, represented by Kübel, have now the day, though they are not so very palatable to the students, most of whom like to pose as very advanced thinkers until the approach of the State examination, when they suddenly develop an intense love for conservative views and pietistic ways.

At Heidelberg there is only one professor who goes regularly to church; even the members of the theological faculty have little sympathy with ordinary "pulpit views" of truth. Although the grand duke desires to have a representative of pronounced orthodoxy in the theological faculty,

he has hitherto not succeeded in alluring any man of pronounced spirituality into the atmosphere of Heidelberg.

At Marburg Julius Wellhausen lives as professor of Shemitic languages and Oriental history. Like most Germans, he makes a distinction between the scientific study of the Bible and the study of it for spiritual benefit. He is not only a man of the strictest moral, intellectual, and spiritual honesty, but a regular attendant at church and a man of prayer.

Göttingen is still the chief camp of Ritschlianism, but the camp-followers seem to be of a somewhat mixed character. At Göttingen, as in nearly all German universities, men are found ready to call themselves Ritschlians, though, according to the generally accepted rules of classification, they should be termed either extreme conservatives or advanced radicals. This singular fact, however, is not unexplainable. Since Schleiermacher no German theologian has given such an impulse to the study of dogmatics as Ritschl. When he began lecturing, theology was almost dead, studied only as a branch of university scholasticism, and generally spoken of as "anachronistic relics." No wonder, then, that all theological students should throng around the reviver, and the character of his system seemed to make it possible for them to remain with him; for his principle was to establish theology on a foundation of its own, independent of philosophy, and thereby give it an universality which, after the days of Schleiermacher, it had entirely lost. This universality, however, is just the very point at which the theology of Ritschl is attacked.

At Halle, where there formerly, while Tholuck lived and taught, were so many American students assembled, there is now only one to be found. Beyschlag, who was Tholuck's colleague and became his successor, still occupies a very strong position, not only in the university as professor, but in Germany as one of the leaders of the middle party; and he is ably seconded by Köstlin, the author of the best life of Luther yet written, and others. In that circle frequent expression is given to the thought that more emphasis should be placed upon Christian experience as the solvent of doubt, the discoverer of truth, and the impeller to Christian action; it is, indeed, the soul attuned to truth which best responds to the touch of truth. This idea is in perfect harmony with Tholuck's teaching, and may be considered a direct tradition from him; but he himself is forgotten.

In Berlin Harnack is the cynosure of eyes, the man who above all others in the university attracts the students. He is still young, of good height, rather slender, and wears a mustache, which makes him look strangely unlike the typical German theologian, and more like his American brother. He is said to be capable of more work than any professor living in Germany, and his great activity evinces itself not only in his lectures on Church history, but also in his writing of books and frequent contributions to papers. When lecturing he speaks freely and with great spirit and power, having his manuscript conveniently near at hand, but scarcely ever looking at it. His line of thought is always clear, and his progress along the path of the centuries is rapid; yet he sees everything worth noticing. Often he makes a brief excursion, and in a few words will describe some historical character in a manner which enables one to see it in clear outlines. He is regarded as a disciple of Ritschl, as conservative "in streaks," as a man of warm sympathies and beautiful spirit.

INDEX OF PERIODICALS, MARCH.

Abbreviations of Magazine Titles used in the Index of Periodicals.

Af. M. E. R. African M. E. Church Review. (Quarterly.)
 A. R. Andover Review.
 Bibl. Sacr. Bibliotheca Sacra. (Quarterly.)
 B. Q. R. Baptist Quarterly Review.
 Ch. Q. R. Church Quarterly Review.
 C. M. Q. Canadian Methodist Quarterly.
 C. P. R. Cumberland Presbyterian Review. (Quarterly.)
 C. R. Charities Review.
 C. T. Christian Thought.
 Ex. Expositor.
 Ex. T. Expository Times.
 G. W. Good Words.
 H. R. Homiletic Review.
 L. Q. Lutheran Quarterly.
 M. R. Methodist Review. (Bi-monthly.)
 M. H. Missionary Herald.

Agnostic, The, Mrs. Frances R. McLane, NE & YR.
 Alston Crucis, Chaps. V-VI, Helen Shipton, GW.
 Alternating Current System, The, Alexander J. Wurts, NE & YR.
 American Cities, Congested Districts in, C. D. Wright, OD.
 Amusements, The Attitude of the Church toward, Cyrus D. Foss, TTr.
 Angel of the Beautiful, The, Bishop of Ripon, SM.
 Apoetasy, The Danger of, P. J. Giong, TTh.
 Aspiration, Katharine Tynan, GW.
 Astronomy as a Religious Helper, E. F. Burr, HR.
 Atonement in the New Testament, The Doctrine of, III., St. Peter, J. A. Beet, Ex.
 Babylonian Exploration Fund, The Expedition of the, R. F. Harper, ONTS.
 Baer on Drunkenness, Views of Dr. A., A. MacDonald, AR.
 Bible Y Are there Errors in, J. J. Lias, TTh.
 Bible, How to Promote a more General Study of the, John H. Vincent, CMQ.
 Bible in the Theological School, The English, C. S. Burroughs, CMQ.
 Biblical Archaeology and the Higher Criticism, Herbert Symonds, ExT.
 Boys' Brigade and the Missionary Cause, The, J. Q. Adams, MissR.
 Bunsen, Baron, The Birthplace of, Marie von Bunsen, GW.
 Canon Cheyne's Bampton Lectures, A. R. S. Kennedy, ExT.
 Charity Organization Society can do, What a, Charles J. Bonaparte, CR.
 Charity, The Growth and Character of Organized, J. G. Schurman, CR.
 Charter-house of Tyrol, The, Margaret Howitt, GW.
 Children's Shelter, Our, Baroness Burdett-Connis, SM.
 China, The Evolution of a Christian College in, Chester Holcombe, MH.
 Chloroform, Natural, T. Wood, SM.
 Christ and the Creation, The, J. C. Adams, AR.
 Church Folklore, II., J. E. Vaux, NHM.
 Churches, Progress of the, Archdeacon Farrar, Dr. Fraser, Dr. Mackenall, Dr. Clifford, Mr. Bunting, RCh.
 Clergy Discipline Bill, The, G. B. Roberts, NHM.
 Christian Church, The Founding of the, Clyde W. Votaw, ONTS.
 College-bred Men in the Business World, W. D. Sheldon, NE & YR.
 Compensation, S. D. Chown, CMQ.
 Conscience, Lady Macbeth, a Study in, J. S. Harris, PM.
 Darkest England Social Scheme, The, Mrs. C. R. Lowell, CR.
 Darwinism and Revelation as now Related, Charles Chapman, ExT.
 Departure, The New, W. S. Blackstock, CMQ.
 Devil's Creed, The, J. H. Barrows, TTr.
 Disestablishment and Professor Goldwin Smith, (Concluded), H. Hayman, NHM.
 Dudleian Lecture for 1891, The, Prof. Emerton, AR.
 Enemies, The, Arthur L. Salmon, GW.
 Endomonic Ethics, Ch. B. Brewster, AR.
 Epistles in the Development of Christianity, The Order of the, Henry G. Weston, ONTS.
 Evil, Deliver us from, A. S. Geden, TTh.
 Expository Sermon on the 8th Chapter of Romans, Suggestions for an, John M. English, ONTS.
 German Theological Faculties, Signs of the Times in, G. R. W. Scott, OD.
 Go Forward, A. P. Hopper, MissR.
 Good Guest, The One, Chapters I-V., L. B. Walford, GW.
 Grace, The Vision of, Du Bose, TTr.
 Half-Brothers, Chapters XII-XVI., Hesba Stretton, SM.
 Healing of Divisions, The, A. Cleveland Cox, HR.
 Health Sermons for Young Men, Gordon Stables, YM.
 Hebrews, The Epistle to the, G. G. Findlay, PM.
 Hell, An Historical Study of, William W. McLane, HR.
 Heredity, Christian Nurture versus a Bad, Amos S. Chesabrough, NE & YR.
 Higher Criticism, The Anti-Biblical Phase of, W. H. Green, TTr.
 Holy Land, The Historical Geography of the, II., G. A. Smith, Ex.
 Holy Land, Industries of the, W. Mann Statham, SM.

Miss. R. Missionary Review.
 N. H. M. Newberry House Magazine.
 N. E. & Y. R. New Englander and Yale Review.
 O. D. Our Day.
 O. N. T. S. Old and New Testament Student.
 P. M. Preachers' Magazine.
 P. Q. Presbyterian Quarterly.
 P. R. R. Presbyterian and Reformed Review. (Quarterly.)
 R. Ch. Review of the Churches.
 R. Q. R. Reformed Quarterly Review.
 S. A. H. Sunday at Home.
 S. M. Sunday Magazine.
 T. Th. The Thinker.
 T. Tr. The Treasury.
 Y. M. The Young Man.

Incidents in a Voyage, Three, E. J. Hardy, SM.
 India, The Young Men of, David McConaughy, YM.
 Jeremiah, A Commentary on, T. K. Cheyne, ExT.
 Jesus Christ, The Enthusiasm of, A. C. Murray, MissR.
 Johannine Question, The Present Position of the, IV., the Author, W. Sanday, Ex.
 Joseph; Young Men of the Bible, H. C. G. Moule, YM.
 Justification and Regeneration, E. B. Ryckman, CMQ.
 Kennedy, John S., A. F. Schaffler, CR.
 Liquor Saloon, The Coffee-House as a Counteraction of the, Robert Graham, CR.
 Louisiana Lottery, Legalized Robbery in the, OD.
 Maloney's Public House, Miss, Blanche Atkinson, GW.
 Man and his Motives, G. Sexton, CMQ.
 Manning, Cardinal, C. Kegan Paul, NHM.
 Meredith, George, W. J. Dawson, YM.
 Ministry, A Professional Training for the, A. C. Bell, CMQ.
 Missionary Work in the Bombay Presidency, Lord Harris on American, MI.
 Missionary Fellowship, W. P. Lisle, MissR.
 Missions, Central American, J. H. Tobey, MissR.
 Missions Within and Without Christendom, Ch. C. Starbuck, AR.
 Missions, The Cuban, A. J. Diaz, MissR.
 Missions, The Reflex Action of, Mrs. E. Curtis, MissR.
 Moon, The, II., R. S. Ball, GW.
 Old Testament in the Light of the Literature of Assyria and Babylonia, T. G. Pinches, ExT.
 Old Testament Literature, Dr. Driver's Introduction to the, T. K. Cheyne, Ex.
 Old Testament, The Teaching of Our Lord as to the Authority of the, C. J. Ellicott, ExT.
 Paul, St., and the Objective, A. R. Grosart, ExT.
 Pentateuch? Did Jews Intend to Teach that Moses Wrote the, W. P. McKee, ONTS.
 Pessimism's Practical Suggestions to the Ministry, G. H. Bead, AR.
 Philanthropies, The Great, V., Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, Archdeacon Farrar, RCh.
 Pilgrims, Justice to the, Alanson D. Barber, NE & YR.
 Plato Taught, Where, James Baker, GW.
 Prayer in Christ's Name, Henry Allen, SM.
 Preacher's Present Opportunity, The, S. P. Cook, CMQ.
 Preaching, Present-Day, H. P. Hughes, PM.
 Preaching to Great Cities, J. R. Day, TTr.
 Prisoner, Reflections of a, A. R.
 Prophecy, Messianic, I. M. Hirschfelder, CMQ.
 Psalms, The Imprecatory, W. W. Davies, ONTS.
 Questions of the Christian Life: The End. Bishop of Winchester, GW.
 Repentance, J. T. L. Maggs, PM.
 Repentance Defined, A. E. Gregory, PM.
 Resurrection Body? What Constitutes the Identity of, J. B. Remensnyder, HR.
 Reunion Party at Grindelwald, The, A. R. Buckland, RCh.
 Revised Version of the New Testament, Some Gains in the, David Brown, ExT.
 Richardson at Home, Dr. B. W., YM.
 Ruined Cities, A Land of, Michael A. Morrison, SM.
 Salvation Army, Captain Great-Heart and the Holy War, The Story of the, F. P. Noble, MissR.
 Samokoy Station, Sketch of, H. C. Haskell, NH.
 Saul and David of the Steppe, A. Michael A. Morrison, GW.
 Sociable Spirit, The, Off Duty, J. Reid Howatt, YM.
 Spurgeon's Character and Career, Joseph Cook, OD.
 Stundists, Persecution of the Russian, J. E. Mathieson, MissR.
 Sunday Evenings with the Children: "The Things that be of God," B. Wanga, SM.
 Successful Works, The Secret of, M. G. Pearce, PM.
 Tax on Barbarism, The, George H. Hubbard, NE & YR.
 Themes, The Secrets of the Effective Treatment of, A. T. Pierson, HR.
 Thieves, The Man that Fell Among, J. E. H. Thompson, TTh.
 Things to Do, Alfred Bishop Mason, CR.
 Timothy, The Case of St. J. W. Horsley, SM.
 Trout of the Chalk Stream, The, B. G. Johns, GW.
 Under Dog, The, Chaps. I-III., L. T. Meade, SM.
 Woman's Place in Church Work, Mrs. J. Butler, Mrs. Sh. Amos, Mrs. Br. Booth, RCh.

CONTENTS OF RELIGIOUS PERIODICALS.

THE ANDOVER REVIEW.

Boston, March, 1892.

- The Christ and the Creation.
Rev. JOHN COLEMAN ADAMS.
The Duplein Lecture for the Year 1891.
Prof. EMERTON.
Views of Dr. A. Baer on Drunkenness.
Dr. ARTHUR MACDONALD.
Reflections of a Prisoner.
Pessimism's Practical Suggestions to the Ministry.
GERALD H. BEARD.
Missions within and without Christendom.
Rev. CHARLES C. STARBUCK.
Eudemonistic Ethics.
Rev. CHAUNCEY B. BREWSTER.

THE CANADIAN METHODIST QUARTERLY.

Toronto, Ont., January, 1892.

- How to Promote a more General Study of the Bible.
Rev. JOHN H. VINCENT, D.D.
Justification and Regeneration.
Rev. E. B. RYCKMAN, D.D.
Man and his Motives. II.
Rev. G. SEXTON, LL.D.
A Professional Training for the Ministry.
Rev. A. C. BELL, S.T.B.
Compensation.
Rev. S. D. CROWN.
The English Bible in the Theological School.
Prof. G. S. BURROUGHS, Ph.D.
Messianic Prophecy. V.
Prof. J. M. HIRSCHFELDER.
The New Departure.
Rev. W. S. BLACKSTOCK.
The Preacher's Present Opportunity.
Rev. S. P. COOK.

THE CHARITIES REVIEW.

New York, March, 1892.

- The Growth and Character of Organized Charity.
Prof. J. G. SCHURMAN.
What a Charity Organization Society Can Do and What it Cannot.
CHARLES J. BONAPARTE.
Things to Do.
ALFRED BISHOP MASON.
The Coffee-House as a Counteraction of the Liquor Saloon.
ROBERT GRAHAM.
The Darkest England Social Scheme.
Mrs. C. R. LOWELL.
John S. Kennedy.
Rev. A. F. SCHAUFFLER.

THE EXPOSITOR.

London, March, 1892.

- The Present Position of the Johannine Question. IV.
Rev. Prof. W. SANDAY, D.D.
The Doctrine of the Atonement in the New Testament.
Rev. Prof. JOSEPH AGAR BERT, D.D.
The Historical Geography of the Holy Land. II.
Rev. GEORGE ADAM SMITH, M.A.
Dr. Driver's Introduction to the Old Testament Literature.
Rev. Prof. T. K. CHEYNE.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Edinburgh and London, March, 1892.

- Canon Cheyne's Bampton Lectures.
Rev. Prof. A. R. S. KENNEDY, B.D.
St. Paul and the Objective.
Rev. A. B. GROSVART, D.D., LL.D.
A Commentary on Jeremias.
Rev. Canon T. K. CHEYNE, D.D.
The Teaching of our Lord as to the Authority of the Old Testament.
Rt. Rev. C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D.

Some Gains in the Revised Version of the New Testament.

- Rev. Principal DAVID BROWN, D.D.
Darwinism and Revelation as now Related.
Rev. Prin. CHAS. CHAPMAN, M.A., LL.D.
Biblical Archaeology and Higher Criticism.
Rev. Prof. HERBERT SYMONDS, D.D.
The Old Testament in the Light of the Literature of Assyria and Babylonia.
T. G. FINCHES.

GOOD WORDS.

London, March, 1892.

- The One Good Guest. Chaps. I-V.
L. B. WALFORD.
The Birthplace of Baron Bunsen.
MARIE VON BUNSEN.
A Saul and David of the Steppe.
MICHAEL A. MORRISON.
The Trout of the Chalk Stream.
Rev. B. G. JOHNS, M.A.
Miss Maloney's Public House.
BLANCHE ATKINSON.
The Charterhouse of Tyrol.
MARGARET HOWITT.
The Moon. II.
Sir R. S. BALL, LL.D., F.R.S.
Where Plato Taught.
JAMES BAKER.
The Enemies.
ARTHUR L. SALMON.
Alston Crucis. Chaps. V-VI.
HELEN SHIPTON.
Questions of the Christian Life: The End.
The LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

New York, London, Toronto, March, 1892.

- The Healing of Divisions.
Rt. Rev. A. CLEVELAND COKE, D.D.
Astronomy as a Religious Helper.
E. F. BURR, D.D., LL.D.
The Secrets of the Effective Treatment of Themes.
A. T. PIERSON, D.D.
An Historical Study of Hell.
WILLIAM W. McLANE, Ph.D., D.D.
What Constitutes the Identity of the Resurrection Body.
J. B. REMENSYNDER, D.D.

THE MISSIONARY HERALD.

Boston, March, 1892.

- Sketch of Samokov Station.
Rev. H. C. HASKELL, D.D.
Lord Harris on American Missionary Work in the Bombay Presidency.
The Evolution of a Christian College in China.
Hon. CHESTER HOLCOMBE.
Letters from the Missions: China, Japan, Mexico, Austria, Zulu, Central America, and Central Turkey.

THE MISSIONARY REVIEW.

London, New York, Toronto, March, 1892.

- Captain Great-Heart and the Holy War: The Story of the Salvation Army.
FREDERICK PERRY NOBLE.
Persecutions of the Russian Student.
JAMES E. MATHIESON.
The Reflex Influence of Missions.
Mrs. ETHAN CURTIS.
The Cuban Mission.
Rev. A. J. DIAZ.
Missionary Fellowship.
Rev. WILLIAM H. LISLE.
The Boys' Brigade and the Missionary Cause.
Rev. J. Q. ADAMS.
Go Forward.
Rev. A. P. HAPPER, D.D.
The Enthusiasm of Jesus Christ.
Rev. A. C. MURRAY.
Central American Missions.
Rev. JOSHUA H. TOBEY.

THE NEWSERY HOUSE MAGAZINE.

London, March, 1892.

- The Clergy Discipline Bill.
Rev. G. BAYFIELD ROBERTS.
Disestablishment and Professor Goldwin Smith. (Concluded.)
Rev. HENRY HAYMAN, D.D.
Church Folklore. II.
Rev. J. E. VAUX, F.S.A.
No Compromise. Chaps. XXIX.-XXXI.
HELEN F. HETHERINGTON and
Rev. H. DARWIN BURTON.
Archbishop Trench's Poetry.
Author of "Charles Lowder."
Cardinal Manning. C. KEAGAN PAUL.
The Story that Rex Told his Wife. (Concluded.)
"FLEUR-DE-LYS."
An Affair of Honor. Chaps. II.-III.
ALICE WEBER.

NEW ENGLANDER AND YALE REVIEW.

New Haven, March, 1892.

- College-bred Men in the Business World.
WINTHROP D. SHELDON.
The Alternating Current System.
ALEXANDER J. WURTS.
The Tax on Barbarism.
GEORGE H. HUBBARD.
Christian Nurture versus a Bad Heredity.
AMOS S. CHESBROUGH.
The Agnostic.
Mrs. FRANCES R. McLANE.
The Alleged Persecution of Massachusetts; or, Justice to the Pilgrims.
ALANSON D. BARBER.

THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT STUDENT.

Hartford, Conn., March, 1892.

- The Order of the Epistles in the Development of Christianity.
Rev. HENRY G. WESTON, D.D.
Suggestions for the Preparation of an Expository Sermon on the Eighth Chapter of Romans.
Prof. JOHN M. ENGLISH.
Did Jesus Intend to Teach that Moses Wrote the Pentateuch?
Rev. W. P. McKEE.
The Imprecatory Psalms.
Prof. W. W. DAVIES, Ph.D.
The Expedition of the Babylonian Exploration Fund.
ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER, Ph.D.
The Founding of the Christian Church.
CLYDE W. VOTAW.

OUR DAY.

Boston and Chicago, March, 1892.

- Signs of the Times in German Theological Faculties.
Rev. G. R. W. SCOTT, D.D.
Congested Districts in American Cities.
Hon. C. D. WRIGHT.
Legalized Robbery in the Louisiana Lottery.
Boston Monday Lectures.
JOSEPH COOK.

THE PREACHER'S MAGAZINE.

New York, March, 1892.

- Present Day Preaching.
Rev. HUGH PRICE HUGHES, M.A.
The Secret of Successful Work.
Rev. MARK GUY PEARSE.
Lady Macbeth: A Study in Conscience.
Rev. JOSIAH S. HARRIS.

Repentance. Rev. J. T. L. MAGOS.
Repentance Defined. Rev. ARTHUR E. GREGORY.
The Epistle to the Hebrews. Prof. G. G. FINDLAY, B.A.

THE REVIEW OF THE CHURCHES.

London, February, 1892.

The Progress of the Churches. Archdeacon FARRAR.
Dr. FRASER.
Dr. MACKENZIE.
Dr. CLIFFORD.
Mr. BUNTING.

Woman's Place in Church Work. Mrs. JOSEPHINE BUTLER.
Mrs. SHELDON AMOS.
Mrs. BRAMWELL BOOTH.

The Rennon Party at Grindelwald. Rev. A. R. BUCKLAND.
The Great Philanthropies, V.: The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. Archdeacon FARRAR.

SUNDAY MAGAZINE.

Edinburgh, London, and Dublin, March, 1892.

Half-Brothers. Chaps. XII.-XVI. HESBA STRETTON.
The Angel of the Beautiful. The LORD BISHOP OF RIFON.

Three Incidents in a Voyage. Rev. E. J. HARDY, M.A.
The Case of St. Timothy. Rev. J. W. HORSLEY, M.A.
Our Children's Shelter. Baroness BURDETT-COUTTS.

A Land of Ruined Cities. MICHAEL A. MORRISON, F.R.G.S.
Industries of the Holy Land. Rev. W. MANN STATHAM.
Natural Chloroform. Rev. T. WOOD.
The Under Dog. Chaps. I.-III. L. T. MEADE.
The Things that Be of God. Rev. B. WAUGH.

THE THINKER.

London, March, 1892.

The Man that Fell among Thieves. Rev. J. E. H. THOMPSON, B.D.
The Danger of Apostasy. Rev. P. J. GLOAG, D.D.
"Deliver us from Evil." Rev. Prof. A. S. GEDEN, M.A.
Are there Errors in the Bible? Rev. J. J. LIAS, M.A.

THE TREASURY.

New York and London, March, 1892.

The Vision of Grace. Rev. HORACE MILLARD DU BOSE, D.D.

The Anti-Biblical Phase of Higher Criticism. Prof. W. H. GREEN, D.D., LL.D.
Preaching to Great Cities. Rev. J. R. DAY, D.D.

The Moral and Religious Value of Higher Education. Pres. E. BENJAMIN ANDREWS, LL.D.
The Attitude of the Church Toward Amusements. Bishop CYRUS D. FOSS, D.D.
The Devil's Creed. JOHN H. BARROWS, D.D.

THE YOUNG MAN.

New York, Chicago, London, March, 1892.

At College Together. THOMAS KEYWORTH.
The Young Men of the Bible: Joseph. Rev. H. C. G. MOULE.
Health Sermons for Young Men: How to Develop the Muscles. GORDON STABLES, M.D., C.M.
George Meredith, II. W. J. DAWSON.
Off Duty; or, the Religion of our Leisure Hours. Rev. J. REID HOWATT.
Echoes from the Study. W. J. DAWSON.
The Young Men of India. DAVID MCCONAUGHT, M.A.

The World of Business. J. H. OSBORNE.
Science up to Date. FRANK BALLARD, M.A.

CONTENTS OF THE APRIL MAGAZINES.

HARPER'S MAGAZINE for April opens with Edwin A. Abbey's superb illustrations of "The Tempest" (the seventh in the series of Shakespeare's Comedies, accompanied by Andrew Lang's interesting and scholarly comment. The frontispiece is a fine engraved portrait of Walt Whitman, who contributes to this number a poem, "Death's Valley," to accompany a full-page engraving of George Inness's great painting, "The Valley of the Shadow of Death." Besides the above, the principal illustrated articles are a graphic description of Lake Superior, "Brother to the Sea," by Julian Ralph, illustrated by Remington and Graham; the third chapter of the famous Danube papers, "From the Black Forest to the Black Sea," written by F. D. Millet and illustrated by Mr. Millet and Alfred Parsons; "An Indian Fair in the Mexican Hot Country," by Sylvester Baxter, with numerous attractive and striking pictures from drawings by Alice Barber Stephens; and "The Last Days of Percy Bysshe Shelley," by Guido Biagi, with illustrations from photographs, and portraits of the surviving witnesses of Shelley's cremation. Other papers of peculiar importance and timeliness are, "Western Modes of City Management," an article of great value for its suggestiveness, by Julian Ralph; "The Mystery of Columbus," a startling exposition of facts from contemporary records, by Eugene Lawrence; and "Some Talk about English Public Schools," by an English writer especially familiar with the educational institutions of his country. An intensely interesting chapter of geological history, "The Ancient Lake Region of America," is contributed by James Richardson. The fiction of the number includes the second chapter of Mr. Howells's new novel, "The World of Chance," a characteristic short story by Richard Harding Davis, entitled "Eleanore Cuyler," illustrated by C. D. Gibson; and another French-Canadian sketch, "La Cabane," by William McLennan, illustrated by C. S. Reinhart. Louise Imogen Guiney and Madison Cawein contribute short poems. And instead of the usual Du Maurier cartoon, there is a charming poem by Thomas Bailey Aldrich, entitled "At Nimrod's Novgorod," appropriately illustrated by Smedley. George William Curtis, in the Editor's Easy Chair, pleasantly discusses several timely and entertaining topics, and pays a tribute of respect to his old friend, the artist-poet, Christopher Pearse Cranch. Charles Dudley Warner makes his first appearance in the Editor's Study, and in his usual engaging manner reviews some questions raised by Lounsbury's "Chaucer." Thomas Nelson Page opens the Editor's Drawer with an amusing character sketch, "How Ierul outplayed Gabriel."

The contents of the CENTURY for April are: "The Three Ages of Man," by Lorenzo Loe, frontispiece; "Our Common Roads," Isaac B. Potter; "The Nature and Elements of Poetry—II.: What is Poetry?" Edmund Clarence Stedman; "Come Love or Death," Will H. Thompson; "The Mother and Birthplace of Washington," Ella Bassett Washington; "Lotto," Italian Old Masters, W. J. Stillman; Note by T. Cole; "The 'Wyoming' in the Straits of Shimonoseki," William Elliott Griggs; "The King," Louise Morgan Sill; "The Total Solar

Eclipses of 1892," Edward S. Holden; "The Shadowy Fold," John Vance Cheney; "Characteristics," V. S. Weir Mitchell, M.D.; "On a Rose Pressed in a Book," Louise Chandler Moulton; "Did the Greeks Paint their Sculptures?" Edward Robinson; "The Feast of the Marys," (play in Provence), Joseph Pennell; "The Story of the Two Marys," Elizabeth Robins Pennell; "The Nanahika," a story of West and East, Rudyard Kipling and Wolcott Balestier; "At Break of Day," Florence Earle Coates; "Fishing for Pearls in Australia," experiences of a diver, Hubert Phelps Whitmarsh; "Khamash," Clinton Scollard; "O' Pap's Flaxen" (in three parts), Part II., Hamlin Garland; "Wolcott Balestier," Edmund Gosse; "In Memoriam, Wolcott Balestier," James R. Campbell; "Starving at Taskoma," John Heard, Jr.; "Some Passages in the History of Letitia Roy," M. E. Angus; "The Ocean Postal Service," Thomas L. James; "The Cyclamen," Arlo Bates; concluding with "Topics of the Time," "Open Letters," and "In Lighter Vein."

The contents of SCRIBNER'S MAGAZINE for April are as follows: "Socialism in Hyde Park, London," "A Meeting on Sunday Afternoon near the Marble Arch," frontispiece; drawn by Hugh Thomson, engraved by C. I. Butler; "The Poor in Great Cities," introduction; "The Social Awakening in London," by Robert A. Woods (the first article in the series on "The Poor in Great Cities"), drawings by Hugh Thomson, Irving R. Wiles, and V. Gribajedoff, engraving by Peckwell, Chadwick, Pettit, Witte, Kruell, M. J. Whaley, E. H. and George Del'Orme; "An Egyptian Banquet," by T. W. Higginson; "The Reflections of a Married Man," (Chapters IV.-VI.), by Robert Grant, to run through four numbers; "The New Parks of the City of New York," by E. S. Nadal, drawings by V. Pérard, W. L. Metcalf, O. H. Bacher, A. F. Jacassay, and W. C. Fidler, engraving by Peckwell and Schussler; "Golden Mashonaland," by Frank Manday, drawings by W. L. Metcalf, H. R. Bloomer, and V. Pérard, engraving by E. Clément, J. Clément, Van Ness, and C. I. Butler; "The Wrecker" (Chapters XX.-XXI.), by Robert Louis Stevenson and Lloyd Osbourne (began in August, 1891—to be continued), with a full-page illustration by W. L. Metcalf; "Paris Theatres and Concerts—III., The Unsubventioned Theatres and Orchestral Concerts," by William F. Apthorp, drawings by Kenyon Cox, O. H. Bacher, and J. Reich, engraving by Kruell and E. Clément; "A Case of Conscience," by Beatrice Witte; "Charles Keene of Punch," by George Somes Layard, illustrations printed from blocks furnished by the author, made from the originals in the possession of the executors of the late Charles Keene; "Of the Blood Royal," by William Maynard Brown; "Historic Moments: The Impeachment Trial," by Edmund G. Ross, ex-Senator from Kansas; "The Point of View"—Spare Time, Politics and Public Opinion, Maupassant.

THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY for April contains: "An American at Home in Europe," I., William Henry Bishop; "A Drive through the Black Hills," Antoinette Ogden; "The Wind's Summons," Graham R. Tomson; "The Private Life," Henry James; "Admiral Farragut," Edward Kirk Rawson; "American Sea Songs," Alfred M. Williams; "The Limit in

Battle Ships
F. Marion
"Federal Tri-
"Some Non-
"Legal Dist-
Leverett W
"Montcalm
Contributor

THE COM-
"But Men
author, Ros-
governance
secret, and
letic Series,
which he co-
C. Davis Es-
Driving,"
us that the
monly supp-
ences. The
leading Nil-
taxes and
portant arti-
bear direct-
Principles"
ious Aspiri-
Seems "dis-
changes" of
trickies," a
Gordon and
number is
Earle Conte

THE COS-
Monument
Home of O-
tic Dance"
Bachelier;
Jerson De
A. M. D'A
Living Opa-
naissance,"
(poem), illu-
Atlantic L-
Prophecy"
only Rest,"
"Count Le-
chemy" (p-
Cora May-
Platt; "P-
imir M. P-
man Nobil-
Wedel; "a
"Social P-

MONTHLY

[Any of

Alexan-
the Gospo-
York: M-
Verban-
the cross-
lic occasi-
cloth, \$1.

Allen,
history at
New York
March 1891

Andre-
Grundtex-
Prof. Dr.
Lebensbil-
8vo, 5 mk

Apt, I
geschnit-
Pp. viii.,

Arnol-
progress
neutraliz-
ized Eng-
ham, Lo

Battle Ships," John M. Elliott: "Don Orsino," VIII., IX., F. Marion Crawford: "Benajah," Edward Lucas White: "Federal Taxation of Lotteries," Thomas McIntyre Cooley: "Some Notes on French Impressionism," Cecilia Waern: "Legal Disfranchisement," "Literature and the Ministry," Leverett W. Spring: "Lounsbury's Studies in Chaucer," "Montcalm and Lévis," "Comment on New Books," "The Contributor's Club."

THE complete novel in LIPPINCOTT'S MAGAZINE for April, "But Men Must Work," is by the well-known and popular author, Rosa Nouchette Carey. In it the narrator, as visiting governess and presiding genius, digs her way into the family secret, and at last banishes the family skeleton. In the "Athletic Series," Julian Hawthorne sounds the praises of walking, which he considers the only proper mode of locomotion, and C. Davis English expounds the mysteries of "Four-in-Hand Driving." In the "Journalist Series," Melville Phillips tells us that the literary editor is much less frequent than we commonly suppose, and gives some odd samples of his experiences. The Countess Norraikow gives a brief history of the leading Nihilists, and traces the famine in Russia to heavy taxes and misgovernment; "Milk for Babies," a short but important article, by Mrs. Louise Hogan, discloses facts which bear directly on the health and life of children. The "First Principles" of writing are unfolded by the editor to an "Anxious Aspirant" for literary fame. The department "As It Seems" discusses the "Deadly Double Track," "Sexual Exchanges" (among writers of fiction), a few "Verbal Eccentricities," and other topics. There are short stories by Julien Gordon and George Edgar Montgomery. The poetry of the number is by Robert Loveman, Sibylla Vernon, Florence Earle Coates, Isabel Gordon and Charles Washington Coleman.

THE COSMOPOLITAN for April contains the following: "The Monument to Columbus, Genoa," frontispiece; "Genoa the Home of Columbus," illustrated, Murat Halstead; "The Rustic Dance" (poem), illustrated by Frederic Remington, Irving Bacheller; "A Romance of Old Shoes," illustrated, Elsie Anderson De Wolfe; "Torpedoes in Coast Defence," illustrated, A. M. D'Armit; "Dumb" (poem), Katharine Lee Bates; "A Living Opal," illustrated, Ernest Ingersoll; "Homes of the Renaissance," illustrated, Wallace Wood; "When Day is Done" (poem), illustrated, Charlotte L. Seaver; "The Crew of a Trans-Atlantic Liner," illustrated, William H. Rideing; "A False Prophecy" (poem), George MacDonald; "The Rancho of Heavenly Rest," illustrated by Irving R. Wiles, Forbes Heermans; "Count Leon Tolstoy," Madame Davidoff; "Nature's Alchemy" (poem), Clifford Howard; "The Theatre of To-Day," Cora Maynard; "Echo and Narcissus" (poem), Sarah M. B. Platt; "Princess Ratazanoff," illustrated by H. Sandham, Casimir M. Podgorski; "Marriage of American Women to German Noblemen," illustrated by F. G. Atwood, Elizabeth von Wedel; "Two English Men of Letters," Brander Matthews; "Social Problems," Edward Everett Hale.

MONTHLY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS LITERATURE.

[Any of these books may be ordered through the Christian Literature Co.]

Alexander, William, D.D., D.C.L. The Leading Ideas of the Gospel. A new ed., revised and greatly enlarged. New York: Macmillan, 1892. Pp. xxxi, 380, 12mo, \$1.75. [Also] Verbum Crucis: ten sermons on the mystery and words of the cross, to which are added other sermons preached on public occasions. New York: Dutton, 1892. Pp. 192, 12mo, cloth, \$1.25.

Allen, A. J. C., Rev., M.A. The Church Catechism: its history and contents. A manual for teachers and students. New York: Longmans, 1892. Pp. xv., 216, 12mo, \$1.50. (See March bibliography.)

Andres, Hermann Viktor, Dr. Das Buch Jesaja, aus dem Grundtext übersetzt und erklärt. Mit einem Vorwort von Prof. Dr. O. Zöckler, Bildnisse des Verfassers und kurzem Lebensbilde. Stuttgart: Steinkopf, 1892. Pp. xiv., 461, 8vo, 5 mk.

Apt, Max. Die Pflicht zur Urkunden-Edition in dogmengeschichtlicher Entwicklung. Berlin: Hochsprung, 1891. Pp. viii., 75, 8vo, 2 mk.

Arnoldson, K. P. Pax Mundi: a concise account of the progress of the movement for peace by means of arbitration, neutralization, international law, and disarmament. Authorized English edition. With a preface by the Bishop of Durham. London: Sonnenschein, 1892. Pp. 172, p. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Arosio, L. San Paolo e le sue quattordici lettere corredate da carte geograf. Milan: 1891. Pp. 536, 16mo, [5.50 mk.].

Attié, J. F. Edmond Scherer et la théologie indépendante. Lausanne: Bridel, 1892. Pp. 48, 8vo, 1 fr.

Bachmann, Johannes, Dr. Praeparation und Kommentar zu den Psalmen, mit genauen Analysen und getreuer Uebersetzung für Gymnasialen, Studirende, und Candidaten herausgegeben. 6. (Schluss-) Heft. Psalmen 119-150. Leipzig: Schneider, 1892. Pp. 423-504, 1.30 mk. (Complete, 7.50 mk.) [Also] Praeparation und Kommentar zur Genesis. 3. Heft. Cap. 24-33. Berlin: Mayer, 1892. Pp. iii., 90-149, 8vo, 80 pf.

Bacon, Benjamin Wisner. The Genesis of Genesis: a study of the documentary sources of the First Book of Moses, in accordance with the results of critical science, illustrating the presence of Bibles within the Bible; with introduction by George F. Moore. Hartford: Students' Pub. Co., 1892. Pp. xxx., 332, 8vo, cloth, \$2.50.

Bäumker, W. Das katholische deutsche Kirchenlied in seinen Singweisen. 3 Bände. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1891. 8vo, 23 mk.

Ballantine, William G. (D.D., LL.D.). Ezekiel: a literary study of his prophecy. New York: Revell, 1892. Pp. 32, 16mo, 15 cts. [Also] Jeremiah: a character study. New York: Revell, 1892. Pp. 32, 16mo, 15 cts.

Barron, L. La Foi et la Raison. Solution des deux grands problèmes qui ont pour but de concilier la raison avec la raison et la raison avec la foi. 4^e fascicule. Laguy: Cohn, 1892. Pp. 32, 8vo, 1 fr.

Bickell, Prof. The Lord's Supper and the Passover Ritual: being a translation of the substance of Professor Bickell's work termed "Meese und Pascha." By William F. Skene, D.C.L. With an introduction by the translator on the connection of the Early Christian Church with the Jewish Church. New York: Scribners, 1892. Pp. xii., 219, 12mo, \$2.00. (See January bibliography.)

Blake, Buchanan, Rev., D.D. How to Read the Prophets: being the prophecies arranged chronologically in their historical setting, with explanations, maps, and glossary. Part I. containing Jonah, Amos, Hosea, Zechariah (ix.-xiv.), Micah, Nahum, Zephaniah, Habakkuk, Obadiah, and Joel. New York: Scribners, 1892. Pp. 244, 12mo, \$1.50. (See March bibliography.)

Bloqueville, La Marquise de. Stella et Mohammed, ou Chrétienne et Musulman. Paris: Jouast, 1892. Pp. iii., 312, 16mo, 5 fr.

Bonney, T. G., D.Sc. Christian Doctrines and Modern Thought. The Boyle Lectures for 1891. New York: Longmans, 1892. Pp. xv., 175, 12mo, \$1.50. (See March bibliography.)

Bourassé, J. J., Abbé. Archéologie Chrétienne, ou précis de l'histoire des monuments religieux du moyen âge. Édition revue et complétée par M. l'abbé C. Chevalier. Tours: Mame, 1892. Pp. 384, 8vo.

(Boyd), A. K. H. (D.D.). Twenty-five Years of St. Andrew's—September. 1865 to September, 1890. Vol. I., 1865-1878. New York: Longmans, 1892. Pp. x., 318, 8vo, \$3.00.

Brandt, S. Ueber das in dem patristischen Excerpten-codex F. 80. Sup. der Ambrosiana enthaltene Fragment des Lactantius de motibus animi. Beilage zum Jahresbericht des Heidelberger Gymnasiums für 1890-91. Leipzig: Teubner, 1891. Pp. 16, 4to.

Brogie, Abbé de. Le Présent et l'Avenir du Catholicisme en France. Paris: Plon, 1892. Pp. 273, 8vo, 3.50 fr.

Brooke, A. E. The Fragments of Heraclion. (Texts and studies. Contributions to biblical and patristic literature. Edited by J. A. Robinson. Vol. I. No. 4.) Cambridge: Univ. Pr., 1891. Pp. vii., 112, 8vo, 5s.

Brooke, Stopford A., Rev. Short Sermons. New York: Macmillan, 1892. Pp. 331, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

Browne, H. J. The Holy Truth: or, the Coming Reformation: universal, because founded on demonstrable truth, science, and religion reconciled. London: Hall, 1892. Pp. 454, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Bruston, C. L. La Sulamite Mélodrame en cinq actes et en vers traduit de l'Hébreu avec des notes explicatives et une introduction sur le sens et la date du Cantique des Cantiques. Paris: Fischbacher, 1891. Pp. 80, 8vo, 2 fr.

Buckley, Arabella B. (Mrs. Fisher). Moral Teachings of Science. New York: Appleton, 1892. Pp. vi., 122, 12mo.

Büdingen, Max. De coloniarum quarundam phœnicarum primordiis cum Hebraeorum exodo conjunctis. Wien: Tempesky, 1892. Pp. 38, 8vo, 1 mk.

Buhl, Franz, Dr. Canon and Text of the Old Testament. Translated by the Rev. John Macpherson, M.A. New York: Scribners, 1892. Pp. viii., 259, 8vo, \$3.00. (See March bibliography.)

Callan, Hugh, Rev., M.A. The Story of Jerusalem. (Bible-Class Primers. Edited by Professor Salmond, D.D., of Aberdeen.) New York: Scribner, 1892. Pp. viii., 96, 16mo, 25 cts.

Campbell, Helen, Mrs. Darkness and Daylight; or, lights and shadows of New York life. A woman's story of Gospel temperance, mission, and rescue work "in His name," with hundreds of thrilling anecdotes and incidents, personal experiences, sketches of life and character, humorous stories, touching home scenes, and tales of tender pathos drawn from the bright and shady sides of city life. With an introduction by the Rev. Lyman Abbott, D.D. Supplemented by a journalist's description of little-known places of New York life; and a famous detective's thirty years' experiences and observations. By Colonel Thomas W. Knox and Inspector Byrnes. Illustrated with two hundred and fifty-two engravings taken from life expressly for this work, mostly by flash-light and reproduced in exact facsimile by eminent artists. Hartford, Conn.: Worthington, 1892. Pp. xii., 740, 8vo.

Carter, Franklin, Mark Hopkins. (American Religious Leaders.) Boston and New York: Houghton, 1892. Pp. xi., 375, 16mo, \$1.25.

Caverni, R. Storia del metodo sperimentale in Italia. Tomo. I. Firenze, 1891. Pp. 538, 8vo, 10 mk.

Christlieb, Theodore, D.D., of Bonn. By his widow. And Sermons, translated chiefly by T. L. Kingsbury, M.A., and Samuel Garratt, M.A. New York: Armstrong, 1892. Pp. vi., 452, 8vo, \$2.00. (See February bibliography.)

Church, R. W., M.A., D.C.L. The late. Village Sermons. Preached at Whitley. New York: Macmillan, 1892. Pp. xii., 316, 12mo, \$1.75. [Also Oxford Movement, Twelve Years?—1833-1845. New ed. New York: Macmillan, 1892. Pp. xv., 416, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.]

Cohen, L. Chronologische Beiträge zur jüdischen Geschichte. Bibliographie, und Biographie. Breslau (Frankfurt a. M.: Hofmann), 1892. Pp. 53, 8vo, 60 pf.

Contemporary Pulpit. Second series. Vol. 6. London: Sonnenschein, 1892. Pp. 380, p. 8vo, 6s.

Cornely, Rudolf. Commentarius in S. Pauli Epistolam III. Epistolam ad Corinthios altera et ad Galatas. (Cursus Scripturæ sacræ. Auctoribus R. Cornely, I. Knabenhauer, Fr. de Hummelauer, allisque. Commentarius in Novum Testamentum pars II. in libros didacticos III.) Paris: Lethielleux, 1892. Pp. v., 619, 8vo, 8.60 fr.

Council of Canterbury. By the author of "The Fight at Dame Europa's School." Salisbury: Brown, 1892. Pp. 76, p. 8vo, 2s. (Imaginary conversations on Inspiration, etc.)

Credo and Credulity: an exposition of the "Apostles' Creed," by a believer. New York: Dillingham, 1892. Pp. v., 200, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

Dale, R. W., D.D. Fellowship with Christ, and other Discourses. New York: Armstrong, 1892. Pp. 368, 8vo, cloth, \$1.75.

Darmsteter, J. Les Prophètes d'Israël. Paris: Levy, 1892. Pp. xx., 388, 8vo, 7.50 fr.

Darstellungen aus dem Gebiete der nichtchristlichen Religionsgeschichte. IV.-VI. Bände. Münster I. W.: Aschendorff, 1891. Pp. xiv., 184, 283, 8vo, 7.50 mk.

Dixon, A. C. The God-Man. Baltimore: Wharton, 1892. Pp. 64, 12mo, 25 cts.

Driver, John Merritt, Rev. Sampson and Shylock; or, a preacher's plea for the workmen. Himself a day laborer. Fort Wayne: the author, 1892. Pp. xii., 271, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

Dumax, V. Revision et Reconstitution de la chronologie biblique et profane des premiers âges du monde. 2^e série: De la création de l'homme à Jésus-Christ; Histoire chronologique des patriarches antédiluviens, des Chaldéens et Assyriens, des Egyptiens et du peuple de Dieu. Fascicule 1^{er}. Avant et avec l'apparition de l'homme sur la terre; Examen de diverses questions dont l'étude doit précéder celle de l'histoire de l'humanité, etc. Etude d'exégèse et de

critique historique. Paris: Lethielleux, 1891. Pp. vi., 126, 12mo.

Eddy, Richard, D.D. The Universalist Register: giving statistics of the Universalist Church and other denominational information, etc., for 1892. Boston: Univ. Pub. Ho., 1892. Pp. 112, 12mo, paper, 25 cts.

Ellinwood, Frank F., D.D. Oriental Religions and Christianity: a course of lectures delivered on the Ely Foundation before the students of Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1891. New York: Scribners, 1892. Pp. xviii., 384, 12mo, cloth, \$1.75.

Eyton, R. The Lord's Prayer: sermons. London: Paul, 1892. Pp. 238, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Farjeon, B. L. Ties—Human and Divine. 2 parts. New York: Munro, 1892. Pp. 210; 211-390, 12mo, 50 cts.

Findlay, G. G. The Epistles of the Apostle Paul: a sketch of their origin and contents. (Books for Bible students.) London: Kelly, 1892. Pp. 300, p. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Fox, Norman. Preacher and Teacher. A sketch of the life of Thomas Rambaut, D.D., LL.D. New York: Forda, Howard & Hulbert, 1892. Pp. 107, 12mo, \$1.00.

Fretté, S. E. Notre seigneur Jésus Christ, sa vie et ses enseignements. 2 vols. Paris: 1892. Pp. xvi., 592; iv., 704, 12 fr.

Fulton, John, D.D., LL.D. The Chalcedonian Decree: or, historical Christianity, misrepresented by modern theology, confirmed by modern science, and untouched by modern criticism. Charlotte Wood Slocum Lectures. New York: Whittaker, 1892. Pp. vii., 218, 8vo, \$1.50.

Gardair, J. Corps et Ame. Essais sur la philosophie de Saint Thomas. Paris: Schneider, 1892. Pp. viii., 391, 16mo, 3.50 fr.

Gay, Charles, Mgr. Evêque d'Anthédon. De la charité envers Dieu. Paris: Leday, 1891. Pp. 136, 32. [Also] De la charité envers le prochain et des devoirs qui en découlent. I. Paris: Leday, 1891. Pp. 204, 32mo. [Also] De la saint pauvreté. Paris: Leday, 1892. Pp. 211, 32mo. (Extraits des œuvres.)

Gell, Mrs. Lyttelton. The Cloud of Witness. A daily sequence of great thoughts from many minds, following the Christian seasons. New York: Macmillan, 1892. Pp. xv., 552, \$1.25.

Gretillat, A. Exposé de théologie systématique. T. II: Propédeutique. II. (Apologétique, Canonique). Neuchâtel: Attinger, 1891. Pp. xiv., 653, 8vo, 10 fr.

Grünert, Max. Die Begriffsverstärkung durch das Etymon im Altarabischen. Wien: Tempesky, 1892. Pp. 46, 8vo, 1.30 mk.

Guio, Léonide. La Mission du St-Tebnen au xviii^e siècle. Vie et Apostolat de Mgr. Pottier, son fondateur, évêque d'Agathopolis. Paris: Tequi, 1892. Pp. xx., 523, 8vo, 4 fr.

Guérin, P. Le pouvoir temporel. Étude sur la chute et sur le rétablissement de la souveraineté territoriale du Pape. Lyon: Vitte, 1892. Pp. xii., 384, 8vo.

Harrison, A. J. The Unreasonableness of Unbelief. London: S. S. Inst., 1892. Pp. 108, 18mo, 1s. 6d.

Haven, Theodore W. Natural Religion. New York: Twentieth Century Pub. Co., 1892. Pp. 200, 12mo, cloth, \$1.00.

Henriot, Saint Pierre: son apostolat, son pontificat, son épiscopat. Histoire, traditions et légendes. Lille: Brouwer, 1891. Pp. xxii., 541, 8vo.

Hewlett, S. S. The Well-Spring of Immortality: a tale of Indian (Hindu) life. New York: Randolph, 1892. Pp. xvi., 223, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50. (The author is superintendent of St. Catherine's Hospital, Amritsar, India.)

Hodge, Edward B. Instructions Preparatory to the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. [Also] A catechetical exercise on the same subjects. Philadelphia: Pres. Bd. Pub., 1892. Pp. 36, 34mo, paper.

Hofmann, Theodor. Die korachitischen Psalmen aus Saadiah arabischer Übersetzung und Erklärung der Psalmen. Programm. Stuttgart, 1891. Pp. 15-31, 4to.

Holland, H. S. Sermons. London: Sonnenschein, 1892. Pp. 188, p. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Horine
Book of I
D.D. Ph
16mo, 50 c

Hovey
ion; or,
iam, insp
ministry.
viii., 573,

Ingrat
lacious be
from the l
don: Lou

Jana
Sancti Be
nam tum
de eo scri
perire pot
naldina.
January
xxxvii., 5

Jesus
tures in c
By a nat
Pp. 61, 12

Jones
Edited by
Pp. xxx.,

Joyan
Lyon: Vi

Joseph
strait Bi
libri xi-3-
18 mk. (

Julian
setting fo
ages and
the hymn
common
their auth
and deno
palters,
1632, 8vo

Kitch
Scripture
8vo, 1s. 6

Kip, V.
Episcopo
cloth, \$1.

Knoll
fundame

Knox
part in
Pp. 340,

Körb
heiligen
dargestel

Krum
Gospel H
from the
8oc., 189

Kum
land zur
den Erz
Pp. vi.,

Lain
Little Cl
Stalker,
411, 16m

Lane
Hopkins
timore:

Leaco
Leaco.

Leuz
tina. N
unter M
eichtigu

Horine, M. C., Rev. A. M. Practical Reflections on the Book of Ruth. With an introduction by the Rev. Eli Huber, D.D. Philadelphia: Lutheran Pub. Soc., 1892. Pp. iv., 122, 16mo, 50 cts.

Hovey, Alvah, D.D., LL.D. Studies in Ethics and Religion; or, discourses, essays, and reviews pertaining to them, inspiration, Christian ethics and education for the ministry. New York, Boston, Chicago: Silver, 1892. Pp. viii., 573, 12mo, cloth, \$2.50.

Ingram, T. D. England and Rome: a history of the relations between the Papacy and the English State and Church, from the Norman Conquest to the Revolution of 1688. London: Longmans, 1892. Pp. 446, 8vo, 14s.

Janauscheck, Leopoldus. Bibliographia Bernardina qua Sancti Bernardi primi abbatis Clavallensis operum cum omnium tam singulorum Editiones ac versiones vitas et tractatus de eo scriptos quatuor usque ad finem anni MDCCCXC. reperire potuit collegit et adnotavit. (Vol. iv. of Xenia Bernardina. Sancti Bernardi, octavos natales secularis. See January bibliography.) Wien: Holder, 1892. Pp. xii., xxxvii., 558, 8vo, 4 vols., 5 mk.

Jesus in the Vedas; or, the testimony of Hindu scriptures in corroboration of the rudiments of Christian doctrine. By a native Indian Missionary. New York: Funk, 1892. Pp. 61, 12mo, 35 cts.

Jones, Lloyd. Life, Times, and Labor of Robert Owen. Edited by William Cairns Jones. New York: Scribners, 1892. Pp. xxx., 203, 12mo, cloth, \$1.25.

Joyan, Fr. Charles-Anatole. Saint Pie V., pape da Rosaire. Lyon: Vitte, 1892. Pp. xiv., 397, 8vo.

Josephi, Flavii, Opera. Editio et apparatus critico-instruxit Benedictus Niese. Vol. III. Antiquitatum judaicarum libri xi.-xv. Leipzig: Weidmann, 1892. Pp. lxvii., 409, 8vo, 18 mk. (I.-V., 63 mk.)

Julian, John, M.A. (ed.) A Dictionary of Hymnology, setting forth the origin and history of Christian hymns of all ages and nations, with special reference to those contained in the hymn-books of English-speaking countries, and now in common use, together with biographical and critical notices of their authors and translators, and historical articles on national and denominational hymnody, breviaries, missals, primers, psalters, sequences, etc. New York: Scribners, 1892. Pp. 1632, 8vo, \$10.00. (See March bibliography.)

Kitchin, J. C. On the Use of Models and Objects for Scripture Teaching. London: S. S. Inst., 1892. Pp. 156, p. 8vo, 1s. 6d.

Kip, William Ingraham, Bishop. The Early Days of My Episcopate. New York: Whittaker, 1892. Pp. x., 263, 12mo cloth, \$1.50.

Knoll. Institutiones theologie dogmaticae generalis seu fundamentalis. Torino, 1891. 8vo, 5 mk.

Knox-Little, W. J. Sermons: preached for the most part in Manchester. New ed. London: Longmans, 1892. Pp. 340, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Körber, Joh. System des Dekalogs, an der Hand der heiligen Väter und besonders des heiligen Thomas von Aquin dargestellt. Programm. Bamberg, 1891. Pp. 100, 8vo.

Krummacher, F. W., D.D. The Risen Redeemer: the Gospel History from the Resurrection to the Day of Pentecost; from the German by John T. Betts. New York: Am. Tr. Soc., 1892. Pp. viii., 298, 12mo, cloth, \$1.00.

Kummer, Franz, Dr. Die Bischofswahlen in Deutschland zur Zeit des grossen Schismas 1378-1418 Vornehmlich in den Erzdiözesen Köln, Trier, und Mainz. Jena: Fock, 1892. Pp. vi., 183, 8vo, 3 mk.

Laing, Frederick A., F. E. I. S. Simple Bible Lessons for Little Children. With an introduction by the Rev. James Stalker, M.A., D.D. New York: Armstrong, 1892. Pp. x., 411, 16mo, \$1.50.

Lauer, Paul E. Church and State in New England. (Johns Hopkins University Studies. Tenth Series. Nos. 2, 3, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Pr., 1892. Pp. 106, 8vo, 50 cts.

Lecoy de la Marche, A. La Peinture religieuse. Paris: Laurens, 1892. Pp. viii., 304, 4to.

Leuzinger, R. Biblich-topographische Karte von Palästina. Nach den Englischen topographischen Aufnahmen und unter Mitwirkung von K. Furrer, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Zeit Christi. Bern: Schmid, 1891. 2 fr.

Lewin, G. H. Ross. Father Gilpin, the most Conscientious Priest in the North: his conformity during the reigns of Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, and his witness against Trent and Geneva. London: Innes, 1892. Pp. 64, p. 8vo, 1s. 6d.

Loesche, Geo. Prof., Dr. Analecta Lutherana et Melanthoniana. Tieschreden Luthers und Aussprüche Melanths, hauptsächlich nach Aufzeichnungen des Johs. Mathesius. Aus der Nürnberger Handschrift des germanischen Museums mit Benützung von Dr. Joh. K. Seidenmanns Vorarbeiten herausgegeben und erläutert. Gotha: Perthes, 1892. Pp. iv., 440, 8vo, 9 mk.

Luzzato, S. D. Hebräische Briefe, gesammelt von seinem Sohne Dr. Isaias Luzzato. Herausgegeben von Elsig Gräber. 7. Band. Wien: Lippe, 1892. Pp. 917-1076, 2 mk.

Lyons, D. Christianity and Infallibility: both or neither? London: Longmans, 1892. Cr. 8vo, 6s.

M'Aulane, W. T. Follow me; or, the Young Preacher: life, character, and descriptive sketches; with "Songs in the Night." Glasgow: Bryce, 1892. Pp. 174, 32mo, 2s. 6d.

MacGregor, James, D.D. Apology of the Christian Religion historically regarded, with reference to Supernatural Revelation and Redemption. New York: Scribners, 1892. Pp. 544, 8vo, cloth, \$3.75.

Marquardt, Geo. Die Historia Hierosolymita des Robertus Monachus. Ein quellen-kritischer Beitrag zur Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzugs. Dissertation. Königsberg c. Pr.: Koch, 1892. Pp. 66, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

Martin, S. A., Rev. The Man of Uz: lessons for young Christians from the life of an ancient saint. Philadelphia: Pres. Bd. Pub., 1892. Pp. ii., 125, 12mo, cloth, 50 cts.

Mason, Arthur James, D.D. Relation of Confirmation to Baptism, as taught in the Holy Scriptures and the Fathers. New York: Dutton, 1892. Pp. xvi., 504, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50. (See February bibliography.)

Merrill, S. M., Bishop. The Organic Union of American Methodism. Cincinnati: Meth. Bk. Conc., 1892. Pp. 112, 12mo, cloth, 45 cts.

Meyrick, Frederick, Rev. The Church in Spain. With map. (National Churches Series.) London: Gardner, 1892. Pp. 454, p. 8vo, 6s. (See February bibliography.)

Miley, John, D.D., LL.D. Systematic Theology. New York: Meth. Bk. Conc., 1892. Pp. xvi., 533, 8vo. (Vol. V. of Library of Biblical and Theological Literature. Edited by George K. Crooks, D.D., and John F. Hurst, D.D.)

Miller, Emory, D.D. Evolution of Love. Chicago: McClurg, 1892. Pp. iii., 346, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

Milligan, W. Lectures on the Apocalypse. London and New York: Macmillan, 1892. Pp. xxii., 299, p. 8vo, 5s.

Morgan, William F., D.D. A Few Thoughts for Lent, gathered from the writings of —, late Rector of St. Thomas' Church, New York City. New York: Dutton, 1892. Pp. 149, 16mo, cloth, \$1.00.

Morris, W. B., Rev. Ireland and St. Patrick: a study of the saint's character and of the results of his apostolate. New York: Cath. Pub. Soc., 1892. Pp. xxxi., 307, 12mo, cloth, \$1.30.

Mooley, T., Rev. The Son. New York: Longmans, 1892. Pp. vi., 332, 8vo, cloth, \$2.50.

Muirhead, J. H. Elements of Ethics; introduction to Moral Philosophy. New York: Scribners, 1892. Pp. xiii., 239, 12mo, cloth, \$1.00.

Mullen, Tobias, Bishop. The Canon of the Old Testament. New York: Fustet, 1892. Pp. xxiv., 664, 8vo, cloth, \$3.00.

Munhall, L. W., Rev., M.A. Evangelist. The Highest Critica vs. the Higher Critica. New York: Revell, 1892. Pp. 199, 12mo, cloth, \$1.00.

O'Reilly, E. J. The Relations of the Church to Society. Theological Essays. Edited with a biographical notice by Matthew Russell. London: Hodges, 1892. Pp. 388, 8vo, 12s.

Ott, Emil, Prof., Dr. Die Rhetorica ecclesiastica. Ein Beitrag zur canonischen Literaturgeschichte des XII. Jahrhunderts. Wien: Tempaky, 1892. Pp. 118, 8vo, 2.30 mk.

Palmer, E. R. The Development of Revelation: an attempt to elucidate the nature and meaning of Old Testament inspiration. A series of studies. London: Palmer, 1892. Pp. 338, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Petau-Malebranche. Israël: son rôle politique dans le passé, son rôle dans l'avenir. Paris: Leroy, 1892. Pp., 61, 8vo.

Pfeiderer, Otto, Prof., Dr. Die Entwicklung der protestantischen Theologie seit Kant. Populärer Vortrag. Leipzig: Reimer, 1892. Pp. 35, 8vo, 20 pf.

Pierson, Arthur T., D.D. The Credulity of Incredulity. Philadelphia: Pres. Bd. Pub., 1892. Pp. 31, 16mo, 10 cts.

Pike, G. H. Life and Work of Archibald G. Brown, Preacher and Philanthropist. With an introduction by Sir S. Arthur Blackwood. London: Passmore, 1892. Pp. 138, p. 8vo, 2s. 6d. (The same, with concluding chapters by James C. Fernald.) New York: Funk, 1892. Pp. xiv., 397, 12mo, cloth, \$1.00.

Plan of the Ages, The; a vindication of the divine character and government. New York: Saalfeld, 1892. Pp. 350, 12mo, leatherette, 50 cts.

Potter, Henry C., Bishop. The Mission and Commission of the Episcopate: a sermon preached at the consecration of Phillips Brooks, D.D. New York: Dutton, 1892. Pp. 27, 12mo, paper, 10 cts.

Pradier, Abbé. Les Fêtes chrétiennes. Lille: Desclée, 1892. Pp. 474, 8vo.

Protestant Episcopal Layman's Handbook, containing an explanation of the innovations of the last half century. Together with a short account of the English inquisition of the seventeenth century. Second edition, revised and enlarged. By an ex-Church Warden. New York: Baker & Taylor Co., 1892. Pp. xi., 319, 16mo, \$1.25.

Reid, Thomas, D.D. The Philosophy of Reid, as Contained in the "Inquiry into the Human Mind on the Principles of Common Sense," with introduction and selected notes by E. Hershey Sneath. New York: Holt, 1892. Pp. vii., 357, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

Reinhold, Pius., Rev. Little Book of Instruction for Christian Mothers. New York: Pustet, 1892. Pp. 202, 24mo, cloth, 25 cts.

Reuss, Ednard, Dr. Das Alte Testament, übersetzt, eingeleitet und erläutert, herausgegeben von Lic. Erichson und Dr. Horst. (In circa 40 Lieferungen). 1. Band., 1. Lieferung. Braunschweig: Schwetschke, 1892. Pp. v., 1-74, 8vo, 1 mk.

Reuss, Franz. Christian Wilhelm Dohm's Schriften "Ueber die bürgerliche Verbesserung der Juden," und deren Einwirkung auf die gebildeten Stände Deutschlands. Eine kultur- und literaturgeschichtliche Studie. Dissertation. Kaiserslautern: Fock, 1892. Pp. 107, 8vo, 2 mk.

Rhein, Paul von. Jesuiten und Evangelischer Bund. Zeitgenössische Betrachtungen über I. Jesuitenmoral und Luthermoral, II. Der Zweck heiligt das Mittel, III. Die Lehre vom Tyrannenmord, IV. Protestantische Verteidiger des Tyrannen und Königsmordes. Speyer: Jäger, 1892. Pp. vi., 88, 8vo, 60 pf.

Richter, Jul. Evangelische Mission in Nyassa-Lande. Berlin: Buchhandlung der evangelischen Missionsgesellschaft, 1892. Pp. 178, 8vo, 2 50 mk.

Robertson, J. The Early Religion of Israel, as set forth by biblical writers and by modern critical historians. The Baird Lecture for 1889. London: Blackwood, 1892. Pp. 320, p. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Royce, Josiah, Ph.D. The Spirit of Modern Philosophy. An essay in the form of lectures. Boston and New York: Houghton, 1892. Pp. xvi., 319, 8vo, \$2.50.

Russell, John E., A.M. The Philosophy of Locke in Extracts from the *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Arranged with introductory notes. (Series of Modern Philosophers. Edited by E. Hershey Sneath, Ph.D.) New York: Holt, 1892. Pp. iv., 360, 8vo, \$1.00.

Salinis, A. de, Père. Marins et Missionnaires, Conquête de la Nouvelle-Calédonie (1818-1853). Paris: Dumoulin, 1892. Pp. 346, 8vo.

Selborne, Earl. Ancient Facts and Fictions Concerning Churches and Tithes. Second edition, with a supplement containing remarks on a recent history of tithes. London: Macmillan, 1892. Pp. 426, p. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Shiells, Robert. The Story of the Token as Belonging to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. New York: J. Ireland, 1892. Pp. vi., 170, 16mo, \$1.00.

Shindler, Robert, Rev. From the Usher's Desk to the Tabernacle Pulpit. The life and labors of Charles Haddon Spurgeon. New York: Armstrong, 1892. Pp. xii., 316, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

Simmel, George. Einleitung in die Moraliwissenschaft. Eine Kritik der ethischen Grundbegriffe. (In 2 Bänden.) 1. Band. Berlin: Reiser, 1892. Pp. viii., 467, 8vo, 9 mk.

Smith, Goldwin, D.C.L. The Moral Crusader, William Lloyd Garrison. A biographical essay founded on "The Story of Garrison's Life told by his Children." New York: Funk, 1892. Pp. 200, 8vo, \$1.00.

Stanton, Vincent H., D.D. The Place of Authority in Matters of Religious Belief. New York: Longmans, 1892. Pp. xiv., 230, 16mo, cloth, \$1.50. (See February bibliography.)

Stephen, James Fitzjames, Sir. Home Sabbaticism. Reprint of articles contributed to the *Saturday Review*. (First Series.) New York: Macmillan, 1892. Pp. 347, 12mo, \$1.50. (Ed. series.) London: Macmillan, 1892. Pp. 420, p. 8vo, 5s.

Stix, J. Zum Sprachgebrauch des heiligen Hilarius von Poitiers in seiner Schrift *de trinitate*. Programm. Rottweil, 1891. Pp. iv., 50, 4to.

Stokes, G. T. Ireland and the Anglo-Norman Church. London: Hodder, 2d ed., 1892. Pp. 398, p. 8vo, 6s.

Strong, James, S.T.D., LL.D. Our Lord's Life. A Continuous Narrative in the Words of the Four Gospels. According to the Common Version. Arranged by —. New York: Meth. Bk. Conc., 1892. Pp. xv., 218, 16mo, 45 cts.

Thein, John, Rev. Christian Anthropology. With introduction by Charles G. Herbermann. New York: Benziger, 1892. Pp. 500, 8vo, cloth, \$2.50.

Thomson, Edward A. Memorials of a Ministry. A selection from the sermons of —. With a biographical sketch by Professor Laidlaw, D.D. New York: Scribner, 1892. Pp. viii., 341, 12mo, \$2.00.

Trissl, A. Das biblische sechstägework vom Standpunkte der katholischen Exegese und vom Standpunkte der Naturwissenschaften Regensburg: Verlagsanstalt, 1892. Pp. 104, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

Updike, J. V. Updike's Sermons. A series of sermons delivered in the Christian Tabernacle at Emporia, Kansas. Edited by George F. Hall. Cincinnati: Standard Pub. Co., 1892. Pp. ii., 288, 8vo, cloth, \$1.50.

Vartabed, Nercès, Mgr. Notice sur la mission arménienne catholique de Deir-Ez-Zor (Syrie). Promenade sur les bords de l'Euphrate, en Mésopotamie. Avec notes du frère Léonce. Rochefort: Thèze, 1891. Pp. 24, 8vo, 1 fr.

Vernes, Maurice. Du prétendu polythéisme des Hébreux, essai critique sur la religion du peuple d'Israel suivi d'un examen de l'authenticité des écrits prophétiques. Tomes 1. 2. Paris: Leroux, 1892. Pp. 416, 8vo.

Vivier, F. P., Chapelain. La Bible. Ancien et Nouveau Testament. Texte de la Vulgate, avec traduction et commentaires. Tome 1^{er} Genèse, Exode, Lévitique. Paris: Féchoz, 1892. Pp. 605, 8vo.

Volhard, M. Le salut universel et les théories adverses, étude de philosophie et d'exégèse chrétiennes. Thèse. Montauban: Granlé, 1891. Pp. 162.

Weill, Alexandre. Les Cinq Livres (mosaïstes) de Moïse. Traduit textuellement sur l'hébreu, avec commentaires et étymologies, avec élimination des falsifications qu'Esa et la grande synagogue ont frauduleusement mises dans le bouche de Moïse. Cinquième et dernier livre; Deutéronome. Paris: Reiff, 1892. Pp. ii., 321, 8vo, 5 fr.

Wharton, H. M., Rev., and Currier, Rev. Father. The Curse and Chains of Roman Catholicism: a controversy. New ed. Baltimore: Wharron, 1892. Pp. 101, 12mo, paper, 25 cts.

Wichelhaus, Johannes, Prof. Mittheilungen aus den Vorlesungen über das Alte Testament. 3. Heft. (Inhalt: aus der Genesis. Herausgegeben von Past. Richter.) Stuttgart: Steinkopf, 1892. Pp. 261, 8vo, 3.60 mk. (1.-3. Bände, 6.20 mk.)

Windelband, W. Geschichte der Philosophie. 3. und 4. Lieferung. Freiburg e. Br., Mohr, 1891. Pp. vii., 257-316, 8vo, 5 50 mk.

Worder
methods of
Bd. Pub., 1

Zunz,
historisch
biblischen
nach dem
Register v
Herausgeg
Kaufmann

Feb. 16.
torical Soc
"The Indu
holding th
those of th

Feb. 23.
tion at Bos
eres were th
and A. E.

Importan
aspices of
Objects: "
al, and edu
educational

Feb. 24.
the Broad
and the sy
Dr. E. P.
Stearns.
"Church
nence."

Consecra
of Sodor a
of York;
Atlanta.

Feb. 25.
briels nam
the Rev. J.
Bishop of
Horstman
bishop in
United St

Feb. 26.
Secretary
diocese of
the late I
and a dis
Bishop-elo

Mar. 2.
Society for
"Allian
Seminary

Mar. 4.
in Trinity
"The Sac
Incarnatio
Lent, 11
of Western

Mar. 9.

Worden, James A., D.D. Bible-Teachers' Guide; or methods of work in the Sabbath-School. Philadelphia: Pres. Bd. Pub., 1892. Pp. 143, 12mo, paper, 25 cts.

Zunz, Dr. Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, historisch entwickelt. Ein Beitrag zur Alterthumskunde und biblischen Kritik, zur Literatur- und Religionsgeschichte. 2., nach dem Handexemplar des Verfassersbericht und mit einem Register vermehrte Auflage, im Auftrage der Zunz-Stiftung. Herausgegeben von Rabbi Dr. N. Brüll. Frankfurt a. M.: Kaufmann, 1892. Pp. xvi., 516, 8vo, 10.50 mk.

CHRONICLE.

(Closes on the 20th of each month.)

Feb. 16. Meeting in Philadelphia, of the Presbyterian Historical Society. Professor Bertrand, of Paris, spoke upon "The Influence of the Huguenots upon the Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian System, with especial reference to those of the United States."

Feb. 23. Meeting of the New England Chautauqua Association at Boston, to celebrate Founders' Day. Among the speakers were the Rev. Drs. J. L. Hurlbut, E. E. Hale, W. R. Clark, and A. E. Dunning.

Important Negro Conference at Tuskegee, Ala., under the auspices of the Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute. Objects: "1. To find out the actual condition—industrial, moral, and educational—of the race; 2. To discover how to make educational influences bear on the elevation of the negro."

Feb. 24. Conference of the National Temperance Society at the Broadway Tabernacle, New York. Dr. Cuyler presided, and the speakers were: Dr. R. S. McArthur, Dr. J. R. Day, Dr. E. P. Thwing, Miss Julia Colman, Peter Carter, and J. N. Stearns. A resolution was passed asking all churches to form "Church Temperance Societies on the basis of total abstinence."

Consecration of the Venerable Norman D. J. Straton, Bishop of Sodor and Man, in Wakefield Cathedral, by the Archbishop of York; and of the Rev. Dr. Nelson, Bishop of Georgia, in Atlanta.

Feb. 25. A Papal Bull received by the Rev. Dr. Henry Gabriels naming him Bishop of Ogdensburg. On the same day the Rev. James Schwebach was consecrated Roman Catholic Bishop of La Crosse, and in Philadelphia the Rev. Ignatius F. Horstmann, Bishop of Cleveland. It is announced that Archbishop Ireland is to be created the second Cardinal of the United States.

Feb. 26. Appointment of Monsignor Charles E. McDonnell, Secretary to Archbishop Corrigan and Chancellor of the Archdiocese of New York, to the bishopric of Brooklyn in place of the late Bishop Loughlin. His appointment was a surprise and a disappointment to the Brooklyn Catholic Clergy. The Bishop-elect is only thirty-eight years of age.

Mar. 2. Twentieth anniversary of the organization of the Society for the Suppression of Vice.

"Alliance Day" at all Seminaries connected with the Inter-Seminary Missionary Alliance.

Mar. 4. Delivery of the first of the Bishop Paddock Lectures in Trinity Chapel. The course is by Dr. Dix, on the subject, "The Sacramental System considered as the Extension of the Incarnation." They are delivered on Friday nights during Lent. The next course will be by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Coxe, of Western New York.

Mar. 9-10. Foreign Mission Conference in Boston under the

auspices of the A. B. C. F. M. and the Congregational Young People's Societies.

"A new quarterly review, devoted to religion, ethics, and theology," is to be published by Houghton, Mifflin & Co. The Rev. Nicholas Paine Gliman is managing editor, and Professors Everett and Toy, of Harvard, and President Cone, of Buchtel College, are associate editors.

The plans for the Religious Congresses to be held at the time of the International Exposition in 1893 have been worked out as follows: Parliament of Religions, August 29 to September 3; Denominational (or church) Congresses, September 5 to 10; Congress of Missions, September 12 to 17; Evangelical Alliance; September 19 to 24; Sunday Rest Congresses, September 26 to 28.

Trinity Church, New York City, will make a gift of \$100,000 to the Board of Trustees of the proposed Cathedral. The corner stone is to be laid on All Saints' Day, November 1, 1892.

The Rev. Dr. W. C. Roberts, of Lake Forest University, has resigned the Presidency of that institution, and will return to his work on the Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church.

The Rev. Dr. Bridgman, whose withdrawal last year from the Baptist to the Protestant Episcopal Church aroused such interest, has accepted a call to the rectorship of Holy Trinity Church, New York City.

The Rev. J. W. Hicks (Church of England) has been elected (Missionary) Bishop of Bloemfontein, Africa, vice Dr. Knight-Bruce, transferred to Mashonaland.

The following changes have been made or proposed recently in the faculties of Theological Seminaries throughout the country:

The Rev. Charles Marsh Mead, D.D., has accepted the chair of Ecclesiastical Theology in the Hartford Theological Seminary, and the Rev. E. K. Mitchell has accepted the chair of Græco-Roman and Eastern Church History in the same institution.

The Rev. Edwin C. Bissell, D.D., Professor of Hebrew and Syriac in Hartford Theological Seminary, has accepted the chair of Biblical Theology in McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago.

The Rev. Gerardus Vos, Ph.D., at present professor in the Theological School at Grand Rapids, Mich., has been called to the new chair of Biblical Theology in Princeton Theological Seminary. The Rev. George T. Purves, D.D., of Pittsburg, Pa., has been elected to the chair of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in the same institution, to succeed Dr. Caspar Wistar Hodge. Dr. Purves has already signified his acceptance.

The Rev. Dr. Fraser, Professor of Systematic Theology in the (Presbyterian) Theological Seminary at San Francisco, has resigned, and the Rev. Henry C. Minton, D.D., pastor of St. John's Presbyterian Church, San Francisco, has been elected in his place and has accepted.

The Rev. William J. Tucker, D.D., Professor of Homiletics in Andover Theological Seminary, has been elected President of Dartmouth College. We learn that Dr. Tucker will stay at Andover.

The Rev. Dr. Christie, of St. Paul, Minn., has accepted the chair of Systematic Theology in the Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny, Pa.

The Rev. Dr. John I. Swander, to whom was tendered recently a call to the Professorship of Practical Theology in Heidelberg Theological Seminary, Tiffin, Ohio, has accepted.

Principal Cairns, who is also Professor of Theology, in the United Presbyterian Theological Hall, Edinburgh, has resigned both positions because of failing health.

OBITUARY.

Bedell, Rt. Rev. Gregory Thurston (Episcopalian), D.D. (Norwich University, Vt., 1856), Bishop of Ohio, New York, February 11, aged 74. He was graduated from Bristol College, Pa., 1836, and from the Virginia Theological Seminary, 1840; was rector in Westchester, Pa., 1841-43, and in New York City, 1843-59; became assistant bishop of Ohio, 1859, and bishop, 1873, succeeding Bishop McIlvaine. Besides sermons, he has published "Canterbury Pilgrimage to and from the Lambeth Conference and Sheffield Congress," "The Pastor: a Text-book on Pastoral Theology," and "The Centenary of the American Episcopate."

Hare, Rev. George Emlen (Protestant Episcopal), D.D. (Columbia, 1843), LL.D. (University of Pennsylvania, 1873), in Philadelphia, February 15, aged 83. Dr. Hare was ordained in 1829; became rector in Carlisle, Pa., 1830; of Trinity Church, Princeton, N. J., 1834; and of St. Matthew's Church, Philadelphia, 1845; professor of Biblical Learning in the P. E. Divinity School, Philadelphia, 1852. He was on the Old Testament Revision Committee, and was author of "Christ to Return."

Howard, Mrs. Isabella J., who has been identified for over twenty-five years with the work of the Women's Christian Temperance Union and with that of Prison Reform, died at Mount Hope, March 7, aged 74. It was largely due to Mrs. Howard's persistent efforts that matrons were appointed in the police stations in New York to care for female prisoners.

McMullin, Rev. Samuel H. (Presbyterian), D.D., at Glendale, O., February 17, aged 61. He was graduated from University of Pennsylvania, 1849, and Princeton Theological Seminary, 1851; held pastorates in Newburg, N. Y., Bellair, Md., and Philadelphia, Pa.; was professor of Greek in Miami University, 1867-70, and of Church History in Danville Theological Seminary, 1870-72; he then returned to the pastorate at Circleville, O., 1873-82, and Glendale, 1882-89, when he retired on account of failing health.

Mermillod, Cardinal Gaspar (Roman Catholic), Bishop of Lausanne and Geneva, at Berne, February 24, aged 67. He was parish priest at Geneva, 1846; gained influence by his services in building the Church of Notre Dame; was consecrated Bishop of Hebron and appointed auxiliary to the Bishop of Lausanne and Geneva; in 1873 Pope Pius IX. aroused the hostility of the Swiss Government against Bishop Mermillod by making him Vicar Apostolic of Geneva, hence the Bishop was exiled, but Leo XIII. used pacificatory measures and settled the dispute; he became Cardinal, 1890. He was the author of many volumes of sermons.

Oxenden, Rt. Rev. Ashton (Church of England), D.D. (by decree of convocation, 1869), at Biarritz, France, February 23, aged 73. He was graduated from University College, Oxford, 1833; ordained priest, 1834; consecrated Bishop of Montreal (and Primate of Canada), 1869; resigned his bishopric, 1878; was rural dean of Canterbury, 1879-84; and since 1879 vicar of Hackington. He has published many devotional works, among which may be mentioned "The Earnest Communicant," "The Earnest Churchman," "Short Comments on the Gospels, for Family Worship," "The Christian Life," and "Portraits from the Bible, 2 vols."

Porter, Rev. Noah (Congregationalist), D.D. (University of New York, 1838, Edinburgh, 1886), LL.D. (Western Reserve College, 1870, Trinity College, Conn., 1870), at New Haven, February, aged 80. He was graduated from Yale College, 1831; tutor at Yale, 1833-35; pastor, 1836-46; professor of metaphysics and moral philosophy at Yale, 1846-71; President of Yale College, 1871-80. His most celebrated work is "The Human Intellect," while he has published "Elements of Intellectual Science," "Elements of Moral Science, Theoretical,

Practical," "Bishop Berkeley," "Kant's Ethics, a Critical Exposition," "Evangeline: The Place, the Story, the Poem," and many others. He was also chief editor of the revised editions of Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, 1864 and 1890. He belonged to a well-known family of educators.

Shea, John Dawson Gilmary (Roman Catholic), LL.D., editor of the *Catholic News*, in Elizabeth, February 22, aged 68. He made his first essay in literature when 14 years old; studied law and was admitted to the bar, 1846; entered a Jesuit novitiate to study for the priesthood, but abandoned this object six years later; in 1853 he published "The Discovery and Exploration of the Mississippi Valley," by which he gained position as a scholar; his attention was turned to Indian Missions, and he edited a series of grammars and dictionaries of American Indian languages, fifteen in number. Meanwhile there had come from his pen "History of the Catholic Missions Among Indian Tribes of the United States, 1592-1854," "Early Voyages Up and Down the Mississippi," "Life of Pius IX.," and many other works, as well as all the articles in Appleton's *Cyclopedia on Indian Tribes*. From 1858 to 1866 he edited the *Historical Magazine*, and in 1883 took charge of the *Catholic News*.

CALENDAR.

Mar. 22-Apr. 12. The Morse Lectureship on the Relations of the Bible to the Sciences, in the Union Theological Seminary in New York, is occupied this year by the Rev. Principal A. M. Fairbairn, D.D., of Mansfield College, Oxford, England. The subject of the course will be "The Place of Christ in Modern Theology." The several lectures are announced as follows: 1. The Return to the Christ of History, March 21st; 2. The Law of Development in Theology, March 28th; 3. The Place of Christ in Universal History, March 28th; 4. The New Testament Interpretation of Christ, March 29th; 5. Christ the Interpretation of God, April 4th; 6. The Father and the Incarnation, April 5th; 7. Christ and the Church, April 11th; 8. Christ and the Scriptures, April 12th.

April 20-21. Annual meeting of the Woman's Baptist Foreign Missionary Society in Boston, at the Warren Avenue Church.

April 25. Annual session of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of England at Birmingham.

May 1. Beginning of the sessions of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Omaha, Neb. Among the questions likely to come up are the abolition of the presiding elderships and the admission of women as delegates.

May 9-14. Annual meeting of the Congregational Union of England and Wales.

May 18. Annual meeting of the United Presbyterian Committee of Home Missions at Allegheny, Pa.

May 19-31. Presbyterian General Assembly meets at Portland, Oregon.

May 20-28. National Anniversaries of the Baptist Churches in Philadelphia at the First Baptist Church and the Grace Baptist Church. Some of the principal events are as follows: 24-26. Annual meeting of the American Baptist Missionary Union in connection with a special commemoration of the Centennial of Modern Missions; 27-28. Annual meeting of the American Baptist Home Missionary Society.

May 25. Beginning of the sessions of the United Presbyterian General Assembly at Allegheny, Pa.

May 28. Annual Convention of the Scotch Universalist Churches, Glasgow.

M

VOL. C

BY TH

In a
nals—
acter a
appear
of the
the co
the edi
sequen
gave i
that it
widely
have
This:
warn r
way in
in hea
their f
charity
having
twenty
sionary
nished
preach
emphas

Now
more
eral re
have in
The
with a
admon
look at
preach
flection
undese
a man
courage
his offi
shrink
call, ju
one Sin
because
God m